

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, May, 1893.

## STUDIES IN FRENCH VERSIFICATION.

### II.

#### *A Comparison of the Alexandrine Verse in 'Athalie' with that in 'Hernani.'*

IN MOD. LANG. NOTES, viii, 1, 10ff., I published the results of a study of the Alexandrine verse in 'Athalie'; in the present article I propose to compare these results with those gained from a similar study of 'Hernani.'<sup>1</sup> In examining the last-named play, I have been able to turn to account some of the statistics given by Dr. Matzke in his "Study of the Versification and Rimes in Hugo's 'Hernani,'" in MOD. LANG. NOTES, vi, 6, 336 ff.

Taking up the different points of interest in the same order as in the first article, I begin with the comparison of the general rhythmic structure of the verse in the two plays. In this regard Dr. Matzke's statistics could help me but little, as he classified only the romantic lines, while for my purpose the classical lines of the play are of special importance. Out of a total of 2166 lines in H, 553 (according to Dr. Matzke) are romantic, and 1613 or 74.7% classical; the latter figure comprising the so-called pseudo-classical verses and a few other irregular lines of four rhythmic elements. These 1613<sup>2</sup> verses I had, therefore, to classify in order to compare them with the 1644 verses in 'Athalie.'

The following table shows the results of this examination. The first and second columns to the right of the headings state how often a type occurs in A and H respectively; the third column gives the percentages for A; the fourth and fifth, those for H: in the fourth, the number of classical lines only (1615) has been

<sup>1</sup> The editions quoted are the same as those mentioned in the first article. Of abbreviations A stands for 'Athalie,' H for 'Hernani.'

<sup>2</sup> In reality the total of classical lines in H amounts to 1615, instead of 1613. This slight discrepancy is due to two romantic verses counted twice by Dr. Matzke (1029 under 3-5-4 and 3-7-2; 586 under 3-6-3 and 4-6-2). So minute a difference, of course, in no way affects the correctness of the percentages given by Dr. Matzke and me.

taken for a basis of calculation; in the fifth, the total of all the verses (2166). The figures in parenthesis to the right of the last column give the percentages which M. Becq de Fouquières assigns to Hugo's verse in the 'Légende des siècles.'

	A	H	A	H(1615)	H(2166)	
3-3-3-3	309	234	18.8	14.5	10.8	(15)
2-4-3-3	254	177	15.4	11.0	8.1	(12)
3-3-2-4	158	156	9.6	9.7	7.2	(13)
4-2-3-3	150	119	9.1	7.4	5.5	(9)
2-4-2-4	150	135	9.1	8.4	6.2	(11)
3-3-4-2	117	96	7.1	6	4.4	(5)
4-2-2-4	98	77	6	4.8	3.5	(7)
2-4-4-2	83	108	5	6.7	5	
1-5-3-3	57	83	3.5	5.2	3.8	
4-2-4-2	46	80	2.8	5	3.7	
1-5-2-4	32	48	1.9	3	2.2	
3-3-1-5	29	56	1.8	3.5	2.6	
2-4-1-5	28	32	1.7	2	1.5	
2-4-0-6	17	5	1	0.3	0.2	
1-5-4-2	16	53	1	3.3	2.4	
3-3-0-6	16	8	1	0.5	0.4	
4-2-1-5	12	34	0.7	2.1	1.6	
0-6-3-3	12	12	0.7	0.7	0.6	
1-5-1-5	10	24	0.6	1.5	1.1	
4-2-0-6	9	6	0.5	0.4	0.3	
0-6-2-4	8	7	0.5	0.4	0.3	
0-6-4-2	8	5	0.5	0.3	0.2	
5-1-3-3	6	11	0.4	0.7	0.5	
2-4-5-1	4	7	0.2	0.4	0.3	
1-5-0-6	4	6	0.2	0.4	0.3	
3-3-5-1	3	12	0.2	0.7	0.6	
5-1-4-2	3	2	0.2	0.1	0.1	
5-1-2-4	1	9	0.1	0.5	0.4	
5-1-1-5	1	2	0.1	0.1	0.1	
5-1-5-1	1	0	0.1	0	0	
1-5-5-1	1	5	0.1	0.3	0.2	
0-6-1-5	1	2	0.1	0.1	0.1	
4-2-5-1	0	5	0	0.3	0.2	
5-1-0-6	0	0	0	0	0	
0-6-5-1	0	0	0	0	0	
0-6-0-6	0	0	0	0	0	
	1644	1615	100.3%	100.3%	74.4%	

From these figures it will be seen that the seven types of classical verses, which, according to M. Becq de Fouquières, are most frequent in Hugo, amount to 72%; and as both he and Dr. Matzke agree that only 75% of all of Hugo's verses are classical, there remain only 3% for all the other twenty-nine classical types, among which there are such comparatively frequent ones as 2-4-4-2 and 4-2-4-2. It is evident that these figures cannot be correct. Possibly M. Becq de Fouquières' percentages are not based on the total number of lines

examined, but on the number of classical lines only, although, in that case, they would be entirely out of place in the connection in which they are mentioned on p. 147 of his book, where it is clear that the percentages for the romantic lines following them, are based on the sum total of all the verses. Even if thus interpreted, however, the figures are far from agreeing with my own. For the same seven types amount in H to only 62%, or to 10% less than what M. Becq de Fouquières claims for the 'Légende des siècles.'

If one compares M. Becq de Fouquières' brief classification of the most frequent types in Racine with that for Hugo, one is led to believe that Hugo's verses differ materially from Racine's, only in so far as Hugo built 25% of his verses on the romantic plan, and moreover, reduced the frequency of the most regular classical type 3-3-3-3 from 22% to 15%. In other respects there seems to be no change worth mentioning. The relation, however, suggested by the above quoted statistics is quite a different one. According to them, Hugo did not only introduce into his verse a certain proportion of romantic lines, but also materially changed the character of the remaining 75% of classical lines, by giving considerably less prominence to some of the more regular types. A contains about 19% of verses of the type 3-3-3-3; that is, it shows a decrease of 3%, if compared with M. Becq de Fouquières' 22% for all of Racine's works. This decrease is found to correspond almost exactly to a proportionate increase of 2-4-3-3; the other types, as far as M. Becq de Fouquières' figures permit of a comparison, retaining more or less the same proportions. In other words, Racine in his later works, wishing to make his verse more flexible and varied, reduced the use of the *most regular* type (3-3-3-3) in favor of the *next regular* one (2-4-3-3).

If we now compare results drawn from Racine with those obtained for 'Hernani,' we shall see that Hugo still further reduces the type 3-3-3-3, which is represented by only 14.5%. But while Racine made up for this decrease by a corresponding increase in the use of 2-4-3-3, Hugo—and this is of interest—not only reduces this type as well, but he also reduces, more or less, the types 4-2-3-3, 2-4-2-4,

3-3-4-2, 4-2-2-4; he practically leaves unchanged the type 3-3-2-4, and he slightly increases the two types 2-4-4-2 and 4-2-4-2, but by far not enough to make up for all the reductions just mentioned. To bring out this point more clearly still, let us examine for a moment Racine's and Hugo's attitude towards the nine most regular types of the Alexandrine verse, that is, towards those verses whose rhythmic elements consist of either two, three or four syllables, and in which the more irregular combinations 1-5 and 0-6 do not occur. In Racine in general, as quoted by M. Becq de Fouquières, these nine types amount to 81.5%; in 'Athalie' they amount to 82.9%, or to almost the same; while in 'Hernani' they amount only to 73.5%, that is, from 8 to 9% less than in Racine. This decrease in the use of the more regular lines corresponds very closely to an increase of the following types: 1-5-3-3, 1-5-2-4, 3-3-1-5, 1-5-4-2, 4-2-1-5 and 1-5-1-5, that is, of those lines in which one hemistich shows the combination 1-5, while the other one consists of rhythmic elements of two, three or four syllables. These six types have gained 9.1%, or exactly the amount lost by the nine most regular types.

The combination 5-1, which, on account of the awkward clashing of two rhythmic accents, produces a very different rhythmic effect from that of 1-5, is by far less frequent than 1-5, although it occurs somewhat more often than in 'Athalie.' Of all the thirty-six possible forms only thirty-two occur in H, just as in A; with the slight difference, however, that 4-2-5-1, which is lacking in A, occurs five times in H, while 5-1-5-1, which is found in A, has no showing in H.

The chief result, then, of this comparison of the classical verses in H with those in A, I should like to formulate somewhat as follows: Both Racine and Hugo show a tendency to enliven and vary the rhythm of their verses, by giving less prominence to the most regular types of the verse. But while Racine reduces only the one most frequent type (3-3-3-3) in favor of the next frequent one (2-4-3-3), Hugo goes considerably further and reduces the nine most regular types in favor of the six next regular ones.

It seems to me that this not uninteresting

fact has often been overlooked, on account of the more radical change Hugo's verse underwent through the introduction of the romantic types. But since even the origin of these romantic lines proper can be traced to the pseudo-classical verses of Racine and other classic writers, we clearly see that both of the tendencies that characterize the rhythmic structure of the Alexandrine verse of the romantic poets, have their indisputable origin in the versification of the classical authors themselves. Therefore, as far as the general structure of the modern Alexandrine verse is concerned, its history presents an unbroken line of continuous development; and it would be overlooking undeniable facts, if one should accuse the poets of the Romantic school of having misunderstood, or perhaps even perverted, the character of the Alexandrine verse, as used by their classic predecessors.

The romantic lines in H permit, of course, of no real comparison with anything in A. But it may be mentioned as a rather suggestive fact, that the six romantic types which are most frequent in H are identical with the six most frequent types of pseudo-classical verses in A; for, also, this circumstance strongly points towards the continuity of development emphasized above.

The number of those classical verses that do not have the principal cæsure after the sixth syllable, on account of the dialogue or some complication of syntax, is very large in H, very much larger than in A. Dr. Matzke mentions some ninety of them. All together they amount to 195 out of 1615, that is, to 12%.

These irregular classical verses—classical, because they consist of four rhythmic elements—must, however, not be confounded with the so-called pseudo-classical verses, of which 'Athalie' contains sixty-eight. The number of such verses must necessarily be very small in the work of a romantic writer; for verses, which would rather suggest a romantic scanning, will simply be counted as romantic lines. Among the 1615 verses set down as classical by Dr. Matzke, I have found twenty-four that permit or suggest romantic scansion, without, however, absolutely requiring it. They are the following: 314, 458, 496, 543, 577, 639, 695, 728, 740, 917, 1085, 1214, 1335, 1415, 1427, 1447, 1523, 1604, 1917, 1948, 2027, 2030, 2105, 2162.

In the following study of the RHYMES of the two plays, I leave out all the choruses and other irregularly rhymed passages in A; for in them, in a number of instances, more than two lines have the same rhyme. Thus the total of rhymes examined in A, amounts to 754, as compared with 1083 in H. The abbreviations used in the following tabular statement are the same as those adopted by Dr. Matzke: the vowels are denoted by v, the consonants by c, and the unaccented syllables of feminine rhymes by e. Also following Dr. Matzke's example, so as to be able to use his figures for comparison, I have marked vc rhymes like *main: vain*, or cvc rhymes like *dernier: prisonnier*, notwithstanding the silent final consonants. This method, although phonetically incorrect, is justified, in as far as French rhymes seem not to be exclusively intended for the ear, but partly for the eye as well. Thus the following schedule will give an approximate idea of the relative frequency of the different kinds of rhymes in the two plays.

	NUMBER		PERCENTAGE	
	A	H	A	H
<i>Sufficient</i>	410	482	54.4	44.3
v	29	48	4	4.3
ve	10	8	1.2	0.7
vc	125	127	16.6	12.5
vce	246	299	32.6	27
<i>Rich</i>	288	532	38.3	49.1
cv	55	89	7.3	8.1
cve	46	45	6.1	4.2
cvc	132	234	17.6	21.9
cvce	55	164	7.3	14.9
<i>Overrich</i>	56	69	7.4	6.4
vcv	8	12	1	1.1
vcve	7	7	0.9	0.6
vcvc	15	23	2	2.2
vcvce	5	16	0.7	1.5
<i>Exceptional</i>	21	11	2.8	1
	754	1083	100.1	99.8

Before I proceed to draw any conclusions from these figures, I consider it necessary to give a few words of explanation concerning those rhymes that are set down as 'exceptional.' Those mentioned for H, are eleven rhymes that Dr. Matzke quotes as especially rich, and it would therefore seem strange that 'Athalie,' a classical play, should contain in proportion, almost three times as many as 'Hernani.' But among the twenty-one rhymes of A set down as 'exceptional,' a number are

included that are not at all especially rich in sound, while there are certain difficulties in the way of their classification under the other heads. They are rhymes which extend over two fully pronounced syllables without intervening consonant sounds; as, for example, rhymes in *i-on*, *i-er*, *i-ère*, etc. Whenever in such rhymes the two vowels form a diphthong, as in *héritier: métier*, there is, of course, no doubt about their classification; when, however, as in *li-er: pri-er*, the two vowels form two separate syllables, the question arises, whether the last quoted rhymes, for example, shall be considered as *v(c)vc*, that is to say as overrich, or simply as *vc*, that is to say as sufficient. The works on French versification to which I have access, contain nothing directly bearing on this question; for all the illustrative examples I can find for the 'rime double' or 'superflue' have consonants between the two rhyming syllables. Quicherat on p. 21 of his 'Traité de Versification française' (2. ed., 1850) says:

"Quelquefois la rime a lieu non seulement entre la dernière syllabe, mais entre les deux syllabes finales. Ce n'est ni un mérite ni un défaut et il ne faut ni rechercher, ni fuir cette *double rime*."

And Tobler says, on p. 112 of his 'Vom französischen Versbau':

"Reime, in welchen der Gleichlaut der Wortausgänge mit dem Vokal beginnt, der der Tonsilbe vorangeht, hat man *leoninische*, auch *superflues*, *doubles* genannt."

If these and similar definitions are strictly applied, there can be no doubt that rhymes like *pub li-er: justi fi-er* ought to be counted as overrich, although I am well aware of the fact that such rhymes are not at all very rich in sound, and that in this particular instance, as also in the case of *i-on* and some other endings, this theoretically overrich rhyme is required. These considerations, however, ought not to prevent us from calling a rhyme overrich, since we do not hesitate to denote as rich rhymes like *trouvé: achevé*, notwithstanding the fact that they are *required* to be rich, and that in sound they are far from being as rich or full as certain merely sufficient rhymes, like *s'ouvrent: découvrent*.

Nevertheless, in the above schedule, I have

quoted the rhymes in question as exceptional, because Dr. Matzke, in classifying the few that occur in H, has adopted a different plan. The more sonorous rhymes of this kind, he, too, has classified on the principle that lack of consonants is to be considered as a kind of agreement. *Géant: néant*, for example, he marks *vcvc*, that is overrich, while in other rhymes of the same kind, he has considered the two vowels as but one. I need scarcely say that this difference in our classifications of such rhymes has no perceptible influence on the percentages given above, the number of such rhymes being very small in both plays. Of the twenty-one 'exceptional' verses in A, nine are undoubtedly overrich (133, 253, 543, 635, 941, 1005, 1255, 1765, 1797), so that the classification of only twelve rhymes could be questioned.

In a comparison between the rich rhymes of Hugo and of Racine, M. Becq de Fouquières, speaking of Hugo, says on p. 34: "la rime, riche et pleine est en général deux fois plus fréquente que dans Racine." The result of my comparison of A and H varies considerably from that indicated by this statement; for in both plays the number of overrich rhymes is about the same, while rich rhymes are only 10% more frequent in H than in A. I am unable to say whether this difference between my figures and those of M. Becq de Fouquières is due to a difference existing between the versification of the earlier and that of the later works of Racine. But it seems very probable to me that such should be the case; for it would correspond to the change in the general structure of the verse which, in the preceding article, I mentioned as an explanation of the difference between M. Becq de Fouquières' and my own statistics. It would then seem that, in his later works, Racine

1. Tried to introduce a greater variety into the rhythm of the Alexandrine verse;

2. That he used rich rhymes to a greater extent than he did in his earlier works.

If one tries to compare the versification, and especially the rhymes, of different authors, one cannot but be struck with the inadequacy of the terms *sufficient* and *rich* as now used.

These designations are well-nigh meaningless,



or at least very vague and ambiguous, if considered from any other than a strictly technical point of view. They tell us whether the consonants preceding the vowels of the rhyming syllables are the same or not, and nothing else. Of the real richness of a rhyme, that is, of the sonority and fullness of the rhyming sounds, they tell us next to nothing. One poem might very easily contain a smaller number of so-called rich rhymes than another, and yet, from a phonetic point of view, the former might have a much larger percentage of rhymes that are really rich in sound. To a large extent, no doubt, this inadequacy is due to the fact that no terminology, however accurately chosen, will permit us to record faithfully all the infinitely varying relations of reality. But this is not the only nor indeed the chief reason. The true explanation, it seems to me, lies in the fact that, as Alfred de Musset puts it, the use of the terms *sufficient* and *rich* is made a mere question of 'une lettre de plus.'

"Gloire aux auteurs nouveaux, qui veulent à la rime  
Une lettre de plus qu'il n'en fallait jadis!"

We call a rhyme rich, if the initial consonants of the rhyming syllables are the same; sufficient, if they are not. We do not take into account—to mention but one or two points—whether the rhyming syllables are *followed* by pronounced consonants or not; nor do we take into consideration that certain so-called rich rhymes, on account of the great frequency or lack of sonority of their endings, are *required* to be rich. In the latter instance, the rhyme evidently does not deserve to be called rich, in as far as it contains nothing beyond what is actually required, and, therefore, in the strictest sense of the word, is only sufficient. This class of rhymes, which is relatively very large (in A nearly one half of all the rich rhymes belong to it), ought to be distinguished from the really rich rhymes, that is, from those in which the poet gives us more than he is required to give; and I think that such a distinction could easily be accomplished by the use of some such term as pseudo-rich, or required rich rhymes.<sup>3</sup> In this connection

<sup>3</sup> A similar distinction has been made by E. Freymond in his excellent article "Über den reichen Reim bei altfranzösischen Dichtern bis zum Anfang des xiv. Jahrh." (*Zs.f.R.*

ought to be mentioned, too, the dissyllabic rhymes in *i-on*, *i-er*, etc., discussed above, which according to their form are overrich, while in reality they are merely sufficient. They could accordingly be called pseudo-overrich, or required overrich rhymes.

According to their phonetic value, the best classification of French rhymes with which I am familiar, is given by Lubarsch on p. 249 of his book. He divides them into five classes, according to which the *rich* rhyme *bijou: acajou*, for example, belongs to the third group, while the *sufficient* rhyme *herbe: gerbe* very justly belongs to the next higher order. But even in this careful classification, no distinction is made between really rich and required rich rhymes, so that the above mentioned rhyme (*bijou: acajou*) belongs to the same group as, for example, *insensé: blessé*. Yet, to my mind, a great difference exists between the two rhymes, and this not alone in sonority of sound. For in the former case, the ear is pleasantly surprised by hearing a rich rhyme where a sufficient one would be correct, while in the latter instance a sufficient rhyme is practically excluded as soon as the first of the two rhyming words is heard. And yet it is exactly this pleasant surprise, caused by finding more harmony of sound than we were entitled to expect, which in the end constitutes the nature and beauty of a really rich rhyme. Moreover, Mr. Lubarsch's classification ought to be rendered more complete, and could easily be made so, by the addition of a sixth group, that should contain all rhymes richer than those forming the fifth. For there is no provision for exceptionally rich rhymes; as, for example, *dextérité: vérité*. Improved and enlarged, however, in these and perhaps some other respects,<sup>4</sup> Mr. Lubarsch's list could do excellent service in classifying rhymes, especially if, as in this article, a comparison of different poets or periods is the object of classification.

If somebody should ask why I myself have not used a more suggestive method of classification than the one adopted in the table given

*Ph.*, vi, 1 and 177), Freymond proposes for this class of rhymes the name 'bequeme reiche Reime.'

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Freymond's above-mentioned article in the vi. vol. of the *Zs.* (p. 19 and ff.).

above I have no excuse to give. I can only state that the conviction of its inefficiency impressed itself upon me only in proportion as my work progressed, and especially when I found myself obliged to draw conclusions from the figures obtained. Then, however, it was too late for me to change my plan without starting over again from the beginning; and to do this I had neither the courage nor the necessary time.

To a certain extent, however, I have tried better to interpret the above quoted figures. I have carefully examined all the so-called rich rhymes in H and A, with a view of ascertaining how many of them are really rich, and how many pseudo-rich. I found that out of the 339 rich and overrich rhymes in A, only 180, or 53%, are really rich; while in H, out of 601 as many as 445, or 74%, are properly rich rhymes.<sup>5</sup> In other words, there are in A only 23.9% of really rich or overrich rhymes, while in H there are 41.1% of the same kind, a proportion that comes sufficiently near to the statement of M. Becq de Fouquières, who, as mentioned above, claims that the rich rhymes in Hugo are twice as frequent as in Racine. Whether, however, M. Becq de Fouquières made a distinction between really rich and pseudo-rich rhymes or not, I do not know; for nowhere in his book does he even hint at it.

I also re-examined the sufficient rhymes proper, separating those whose final consonants are silent, from those in which they are sounded. The proportion is the following: out of 410 sufficient rhymes in A, 285, or 70%, end in a pronounced consonant, and in H, out of 482 sufficient rhymes, 352, or 73%, belong to the same class. In this regard there is, therefore, almost no difference between the two plays. In fact, I am inclined to believe, without, however, basing this statement on careful statistics, that, in general, the sufficient rhymes in H are no more sonorous than those in A. In part this assertion is proved by the fact that the rhymes *v : v* in Racine show scarcely any

<sup>5</sup> There is some difficulty in deciding whether a rich rhyme is required or not; for different authorities disagree in some respects regarding this point. I have tried to apply the rules laid down by Lubarsch (p. 250 and ff.), which are based on Quicherat and Quitard. I may mention that for the endings *-eux* and *-eur* I have, therefore, not considered the rich rhyme as absolutely necessary.

less sonorous vowels than in Hugo. For A, in 29 rhymes of this kind, we find: *ieu* three times, *u* four times, *eau* four times, *ui* seven times, *oi* eleven times. For H, we find in 48 rhymes of this kind: *ou* once, *ie* twice, *ieu* twice, *eu* three times, *ui* four times, *oi* thirty-six times. Thus it seems that in regard to sufficient rhymes, there exists hardly any difference between the romantic writers and their classic predecessors, except in the frequency of their occurrence. There is not, as with the rich rhymes, any noticeable difference in the phonetic value of the rhyming syllables.

The comparative frequency of sufficient rhymes in H, is especially interesting, if contrasted with the theoretical demand of the romantic school, that none but rich rhymes should be used, as Banville has formulated it in his 'Petit traité de poésie française,' "Sans consonne d'appui pas de rime." For even if we should interpret *consonne d'appui* as referring to the consonants following as well as preceding the rhyming vowels, even then quite a number of Hugo's rhymes would be "pas de rimes." And if we interpret *consonne d'appui* as it is generally understood, as many as 44% of Hugo's rhymes in H would be no rhymes at all. It is also interesting to compare the frequency of rich rhymes in H, with the use of such rhymes in Old French poetry, for which we possess so excellent statistics in in Prof. Freymond's often quoted article. Among the one hundred and eighty-nine works examined by Prof. Freymond, there are no less than thirty-five that contain as many or more rich rhymes than H, varying from 56% to 87% and representing an average<sup>6</sup> of no less than 70% of rich rhymes. All the one hundred and eighty-nine works together represent an average<sup>6</sup> of 34% of rich rhymes. Thus it would seem as if the romantic writers, in regard to the use of rich rhymes, were not quite so far ahead of their Old French colleagues as one may generally be inclined to believe. In fact it seems doubtful to me whether any poem of the nineteenth century could be found to excel the 87% of rich rhymes

<sup>6</sup> These averages are not given by Prof. Freymond. In making them out I have considered all the different works as of equal importance, without taking their relative length into consideration.

in the 'Pièce anonyme de Jean de Condé' of the beginning of the fourteenth century.

This comparison of the rhymes in 'Athalie' and 'Hernani,' has somewhat exceeded the limits of my original plan, but not to the detriment of its value, I hope. I myself consider this part of the investigation as purely tentative, but hope that through it some one else may be induced to treat the subject more in full. For it seems to me a task of considerable importance and interest to decide, on the basis of suggestive and reliable statistics, the relative phonetic value of the rhymes of the classic and romantic writers. Lubarsch wrote in 1879:

"Neben einem feinen Verständnis für den Klang französischer Laute ist überdiess die Aufstellung einer Statistik des Reimes nach den besten Dichtern erforderlich, von welcher zur Zeit kaum die Anfänge vorliegen."

And, as far as I know, this condition of things has not changed much during the last fourteen years.

Besides the general rhythmic structure of the verse and the nature of the rhymes, there still remain for me to examine a few points of secondary interest which I shall treat briefly in the following order: 1. the 'enjambement'; 2. the sixth syllable; 3. the dividing of verses in dialogue.

With regard to the first-named point, the use of the 'enjambement,' it is almost impossible to make any sufficiently definite statement, without entering upon a discussion about the exact meaning of the term. Perhaps no other term relating to French versification has been understood and defined so differently by different authorities, as one can easily convince oneself by reading the respective chapters in Becq de Fouquières or in Lubarsch. Generally speaking, one may say that the definition of the 'enjambement' during the present century has become more restricted than the term was understood by the critics of the classic period. Consequently, even those modern critics, who, like Quicherat, condemn the 'enjambement' under all circumstances, by virtue of the more restricted sense they give to the word, admit certain cases of rhythmic overflow of which the classical critics would not have approved. M. Becq de Fouquières gives the following definition on p. 270:

"Il y aura enjambement d'un vers sur un autre lorsque le rythme et le sens auront ensemble enjambé, c'est-à-dire franchi l'intervalle qui sépare ce vers du suivant."

And further on he says still more definitely:

"Il y a enjambement lorsqu'il y a suppression du temps aspiratoire, lorsque le sens et la cohésion syntaxique ne permettent pas d'introduire un temps aspiratoire, si court qu'il soit, entre la fin d'un vers et le commencement du suivant."

If we accept this definition, not a single 'enjambement' can be found in 'Athalie,' nor probably in any classical French tragedy. If we, however, apply the old, somewhat vague, rule that the sense or syntactical construction of one verse must not end anywhere within the following verse, then, indeed, we could find a few instances of 'enjambement' in A; as, for example, 653:4, 689:90, 1553:4, 1561:2. But these few instances are of but little importance and cannot be compared to the frequent and bold 'enjambements' in H. A detailed account of the use of the 'enjambement' in H, instructive though it might be, is therefore not given here, because the facts gained cannot be compared with anything in A.

The next point I wish to consider, is the nature of the syllable before the *cæsura*. It is well known that the romantic poets, even in their most irregular romantic lines, have observed the traditions of the classical verse in so far as they made the sixth syllable of each line to be the last accented syllable of a word. Consequently, every modern romantic verse, but for the sense, could be scanned, rhythmically correct, as a classical verse. This restriction appears entirely useless; for it is merely the observance of a traditional form, for which its former *raison d'être* has disappeared. In a strictly romantic line, with no rhythmic accent on the sixth syllable, the nature of this syllable can no longer be of any real importance for the rhythm of the verse. But since, as a matter of fact, the restriction has been observed, the nature of the sixth syllable in romantic lines is of the same interest as in classical verses. In regard to this point, M. Becq de Fouquières says on p. 81:

"Chez un grand nombre de poètes, les syllabes féminines de l'hémistiche se rencontrent presque dans la moitié des vers. Toutefois,

cette proportion, qui jadis était en effet de près de 50 pour 100, est descendue à 15 ou 20 pour 100 dans Racine. Chez Victor Hugo, le même cas me paraît un peu plus fréquent."

To test this proportion I examined four hundred verses in A, and the same number in H, in both plays the lines 1-101, 401-501, 1001-1101, 1601-1701. For A, I found that the larger of the two figures given by M. Becq de Fouquières agreed with the result of my examination, the following being the percentages for the different hundreds of lines: 18, 22, 21, 21, that is, an average of 20.5%. For H, on the other hand, I found somewhat lower percentages, namely 25, 18, 15, 19, or an average of 19.3%. It would, therefore, seem, that in this respect, there is no difference between the two works; both containing about 20% of verses with feminine cæsuras.

Finally, as for the division of lines in animated dialogue, a mere glance shows the great difference between a classical and a romantic play. This difference closely corresponds to the fundamental differences between the art-ideals of the two periods, differences that are throughout more strikingly manifested in drama than in any other department of literature. It is only on account of this close interrelation between form and idea, that a comparison of the broken lines in both plays can be claimed to be really interesting.

Out of the one thousand six hundred and forty-four lines in A, only fifty-nine, or about 3.6%, are broken; and of these as many as fifty-one are broken only once, while only eight verses in the whole play consist of three parts. Of verses divided into more than three parts not a single instance is found in A. Aside from this general proportion it is, however, interesting to notice that among the fifty-one verses consisting of two parts, there are only thirty in which the division coincides with the cæsura, while in twenty the division occurs after the first rhythmic element, and in only one instance (1701) after the third element. I mention this, because one is generally inclined

<sup>7</sup> Since M. Becq de Fouquières wrote this, careful statistics on feminine cæsuras in Old French have been published by Georg Otten in "Über die Cæsur im Altfranzösischen," Dissertation. Greifswald, 1884. In nineteen works examined by Mr. Otten the feminine cæsuras vary from 31 per cent to 53 per cent. Considering all the works as of equal importance, the average would be 41 per cent.

to think (but as it would seem, erroneously), that almost all of the few broken verses the classical drama contains, are divided at the cæsura. Never, however, except in one single instance (1723), does the division occur anywhere else but at the end of a rhythmic element of the verse, while in 'Hernani' it may come anywhere in the line regardless of both cæsura and rhythmic elements. Thus, it is practically impossible to classify the broken lines in H, except according to the number of parts into which they are divided. In all, there are for H as many as four hundred and fifty-two broken lines, or 21%. Of these three hundred and forty-eight are divided into two parts, eighty-six into three, sixteen into four, one (242) into five and one (18) into six parts. It seems clear that a single verse, recited by four, or even by five or six speakers—although not necessarily by so many different persons—can no longer be heard as a rhythmic unity; it must needs become prose to the hearer, and the effect upon the reader is not very different from that upon the hearer, for the reader's eye encounters the same difficulties in finding the beginning and end of such verses as the ear of the listener.

Thus we must admit that in this, as in some other respects, the romantic poets, at times, have gone too far in their desire to correct the obvious defects of strictly classical versification, and that they have given us a number of lines that indeed deserve the name of rhymed prose. We cannot but add, however, that in the works of the best among them such instances occur very rarely, and that they are scarcely ever caused by indifference or carelessness on the part of the writer, but that, as Professor Tobler expresses it, they are rather due to the

"Streben, in den einförmigen Gang der dichterischen Rede Wechsel und Bewegung zu bringen und durch überraschende Pausen besondere Wirkungen zu erzielen."<sup>8</sup>

A. R. HOHLFELD.

Vanderbilt University.

<sup>8</sup> At the moment of sending this article to press, I received the first instalment of the second volume of Gröber's 'Grundriss,' containing Professor Stengel's "Romanische Verslehre." A cursory examination of the work shows me, that modern French versification is only touched on in a few words, so that I do not think any part of my investigation will be affected by a more careful study of Professor Stengel's treatise.



# AMERICAN PRONUNCIATION AGAIN.<sup>1</sup>

THE fourth circular of the Phonetic Section of the MOD. LANG. ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA called out a larger number of responses than any of the others; moreover, as most of the questions were comparatively easy, it is probable that the replies (which almost invariably show great care and intelligence) are even more trustworthy than the ones previously recorded. I wish to express here my gratitude to all my correspondents, and especially to those who distributed copies of the document among their friends.

Returns have come in from England and Canada, from Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, North Dakota, and Texas, and from all the States east of the Mississippi, except Delaware and Georgia. The answers number one hundred and ninety-two: two from England, five from Canada, sixty-three from New England, twenty-six from the Middle States, seventeen from Ohio, thirty-three from other Northern and Western States, twenty-one from the Virginias, twenty-one from the rest of the South, and four representing no region in particular. I have examined the results very minutely, and have tried to tabulate them in such a way as to bring out all their significance. Some of the facts thus ascertained will be stated in this article, but the important subjects of the *a-æ* words (such as 'half,' 'pass') and the *o-ɔ* series ('dog,' 'off,' etc.) I shall reserve for separate treatment.

I must call attention once more to the fact that the Phonetic Section has, in general, limited its field of observation to the usual speech of educated native Americans—the pronunciation that our teachers, doctors, clergymen, lawyers use (or think they use) in their ordinary conversation. It is doubtless somewhat harder to trace geographical divisions for such a highly artificial language than for the vulgar dialects; but even the latter are hopelessly mixed and interwoven. In fact, so far as I know, there is no such thing as a homogeneous dialect or an unconsciously formed pronunciation. The child constructs his speech by conscious or half-conscious

study, imitation, and self-correction; he takes one word from a parent, another from a playmate, another from a stranger, sometimes leaving new acquisitions in their original shape, and sometimes bringing them into harmony with similar words in his own store; later he borrows by wholesale from books, and often remodels whole series of words under the influence of school. Even when he is grown, his pronunciation remains in a plastic state, and is easily moulded by contact with a new environment. All this is true of the poor as well as of the rich. The speech of the scholar is unlike that of the laborer, because of the different nature and the greater diversity of the materials from which it is built; but both dialects are composite, inconsistent, unstable; and either one is (it seems to me) an object of scientific interest and a proper subject for investigation. Whatever be the quality of the speech we are examining, we must not expect distinct geographical boundaries: the most we can do is to establish, roughly, for the different parts of the country, the relations which certain conflicting types of pronunciation bear to each other in the class of society we are observing.

I shall now examine the points covered by questions i., ii., iii., iv., and v. in the above-mentioned circular. The phonetic alphabet I shall use is that of the American Dialect Society:—

<i>a</i> = 'a' in 'father,'	<i>ɔ</i> = 'a' in 'soda,'
<i>æ</i> = 'a' in 'hat,'	<i>i</i> = 'i' in 'hit,'
<i>e</i> = 'e' in 'pet,'	<i>ɛ</i> = 'ea' in 'heat,'
<i>ɛ̃</i> = 'a' in 'hate,'	<i>o</i> = 'o' in 'hot,'
<i>ē</i> = 'u' in 'hurt,'	<i>ɔ̃</i> = 'au' in 'haul.'

I shall give the name "eastern New England" (E. N. E.) to the part of the United States east of the Connecticut River; "western New England" (W. N. E.) will comprise Vermont, western Massachusetts, and most of Connecticut; my "Middle States" are New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland; my "North" includes W. N. E., the Middle States, Ontario, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois; the "South" consists of Texas and Louisiana and all the region east of the Mississippi and South of the Ohio and Potomac Rivers; my "West" includes the rest of the United States, as far as it is represented in my answers.

<sup>1</sup> See MOD. LANG. NOTES, vi., 2 and 8 (pp. 82-87 and 458-467).

## I. TYPES OF R.

The inhabitants of fully two-thirds of our country are generally inclined to pronounce *r* wherever the standard spelling requires it; but in the South and in E. N. E. the natural tendency of most speakers is to sound *r* only before a vowel. In these *r*-less regions, however, the schools have succeeded (to a very limited extent) in resuscitating the *r*, and in E. N. E. the Irish influence is working toward the same end; on the other hand, Anglomania, which is rife in some of our Atlantic cities, tends in the opposite direction. It is my belief that the school-master, the spelling-book, and the dictionary, whose authority is well-nigh absolute in sparsely settled and comparatively uncultivated communities, have been largely responsible for the prevalence of *r* in the North and West; and here, too, perhaps, the influence of Irish and Scotch immigration has made itself felt. I hope to be able to return to this subject at some future time.

We can distinguish, in American pronunciation, three varieties of the consonant *r*. The first, which I shall call "normal *r*," is formed by bringing the tip of the tongue near the roots of the teeth, leaving a small, triangular hole, through which the voiced breath issues with a slight buzz: this is the type nearly always chosen by E. N. E. speakers who pronounce an artificial *r*; it is used also by Americans everywhere (so far as I know) for *r* before a vowel. The second variety, a "retracted *r*," seems to be used only at the end of a word or before a consonant, and is therefore confined, in general, to the North and West; it is made by turning the point of the tongue up toward the roof of the mouth, leaving an opening considerably larger than that required for normal *r*. The third type, to which I shall give the name "anticipated *r*," may take the place of number two after *a*, *ē*, *ə*, or *ɔ*, as in 'hard,' 'hurt,' 'paper,' 'horse'; it is formed simultaneously with the preceding vowel, the tip of the tongue being lifted up toward the palate as soon as the *a*, *ē*, *ə*, or *ɔ* begins. This third variety may be divided into two classes, "audible" and "inaudible," according to the extent to which the tongue-point is raised: if the tongue is considerably

lifted (as it generally is in the North and West), the acoustic effect of the combination is that of a somewhat muffled vowel followed by a strong retracted *r*; if, on the other hand, the elevation of the tongue-tip is sufficient to be felt by the speaker, but not marked enough to produce upon the hearer the impression of an *r*, we have the inaudible type, which appears to be very common among cultivated persons in the South.

In words like 'for,' 'horse,' where final 'r' or 'r' plus consonant is preceded by *ɔ*, if the 'r' is not sounded as a consonant, it may be either omitted altogether (*fɔ*, *hɔs*) or pronounced as an *ə* (*fɔə*, *hɔəs*). When the preceding vowel is *a* (as in 'far,' 'hard'), this *ə*-substitute for *r* can scarcely be distinguished from the *a*, unless the word is drawled (*faə*, *haəd*); and after *ē* or *ə* it disappears entirely ('fur'=*fē*, 'hurt'=*hēt*, 'paper'=*pēpə*, 'lettered'=*letəd*). On the other hand, with persons who use anticipated *r*, a final unaccented 'er' often becomes simply a retracted *r*: 'paper'=*pēp-r*.

In the vulgar pronunciation of the South, *r* not before a vowel is almost universally omitted or changed to *ə*. This omission or change is perhaps a trifle less general in the uneducated speech of E. N. E. In the North and West the popular dialects retain some form of consonant *r*.

Below will be found the percentages of votes on the treatment of 'r' in the words 'horse,' 'hard,' 'hurt,' 'paper.' The sign *r* designates both the normal and the retracted type; a superposed *r* indicates anticipated *r*.

	HORSE.				HARD.			
	<i>ɔr</i>	<i>ɔ<sup>r</sup></i>	<i>ɔə</i>	<i>ɔ</i>	<i>ar</i>	<i>a<sup>r</sup></i>	<i>aə</i>	<i>a</i>
E. N.E.	11	14	15	60	7	13	2	78
South	10	40	20	30	12	40	15	33
North	53	41	2	4	53	41	0	6
West	12	82	6	0	6	82	0	12
	HURT.				PAPER.			
	<i>ēr</i>	<i>ē<sup>r</sup></i>	<i>ē</i>		<i>ər</i>	<i>ə<sup>r</sup></i>	<i>ə</i>	
E. N.E.	11	16	73		3	13	84	
South	16	54	30		5	54	41	
North	41	53	6		41	53	6	
West	12	82	6		15	80	5	

It will be seen that E. N. E. is opposed, by an overwhelming majority, to the pronunciation of *r* in these words, and especially in 'paper' and 'hard.' The South has a few advocates of normal *r*, but is in general almost evenly divided between omission or change to *ə*, on the one hand, and anticipated *r* (probably the inaudible kind), on the other; my six correspondents in eastern Virginia agree in dropping the *r* from all the words; the Carolinas are almost unanimous for anticipated *r* in 'paper' and 'hurt,' and the Gulf States strongly favor the same type in 'paper.' Anticipated *r* (doubtless the audible variety) predominates for all the words in the West, and also in Illinois, central Ohio, and western and central New York and Pennsylvania; it prevails for 'hurt' and 'paper,' but not for the other words, in northern Ohio and in Michigan. Maryland and Kentucky seem to be on the line between North and South. The pronunciation of *ēr* before a consonant as *ēi* ('hurt' = *hēif*), which is common in New York City, Philadelphia, and some parts of the South, was not called for by my circular.

## 2. PRONUNCIATION OF 'WH.'

The list given in the circular included eighteen typical cases of 'wh' before 'a,' 'e,' and 'i,' and also the words 'whoa!,' 'why!,' and 'why?.' My correspondents from all parts of the country are nearly unanimous in favor of *hw* in all the examples except 'wharf,' 'whoa,' and the interjection 'why.' Several gentlemen, however, tell me that in many of the cases their treatment of the 'wh' varies according to the stress. Two Bostonians have voiceless *w* in all the words; and four correspondents (from New York City, New Jersey, southern Pennsylvania, and central Ohio) have voiced *w* in all. I am told that this latter sound is very common among cultivated speakers in Salem, Mass. Formerly, no doubt, it was in general use in N. E. From Maine, Philadelphia, northern Ohio, Indiana, North Dakota, western Tennessee, and Louisiana come a few scattering votes for some kind of *w*, without *h*, in 'what,' 'whatever,' 'when,' 'whenever,' 'wherever,' 'whether,' 'which'—words in which the syllable containing 'wh' is very often unaccented. 'Whale' with voiced

*w* is reported from eastern Massachusetts; 'wheel,' 'whirl,' 'whit,' 'white,' with the same sound, from southern Ohio; 'whip,' 'white,' 'why?,' with the same initial consonant, from western Tennessee; and 'wheel,' 'whistle,' 'whit,' with voiceless *w*, from Indiana.

The percentages for the three exceptional words, 'wharf,' 'whoa!,' 'why!,' are given below. The symbol *w* denotes a voiced, and *w* a voiceless *w*.

	WHARF.			WHOA!			WHY!		
	hw	w	w	hw	w	w	hw	w	w
E. N. E.	92	4	4	92	4	4	83	6	11
North	73	2	25	75	3	22	53	6	41
West	88	0	12	70	12	18	17	12	71
South	65	2	33	31	7	62	47	5	48

The West and northern Ohio are very strongly in favor of voiced *w* in 'why!.' Virginia and the Carolinas are almost unanimous for the same sound in 'whoa!.' Voiced *w* is said to be the usual Virginian pronunciation of 'wh' in 'wharf.' I have, by the way, evidence that this word was vulgarly called *vof* in Boston a hundred years ago.

## 3. 'ERIE,' 'MARY,' ETC.

Words which, according to the dictionaries, end in *ir* or in *ēr* are really pronounced with a glide, *ə*, before or instead of the *r*; the preceding vowel varies between *i* and *ī*, *æ* and *e*: 'beer' = *biar*, *biə*, *biar*, or *biə*; 'hair' = *hæar*, *hæə*, *heər*, or *heə*. If a syllable beginning with a vowel is added to such a word, the *r* is kept or restored, and the glide is regularly preserved: 'beery' = *biəri* or *biəri*, 'hairy' = *hæəri* or *heəri*. Three Southerners, however, one from the Valley of Virginia and two from North Carolina, tell me that in their dialect the glide is lost in derivatives of words in *-ær*, 'hairy' being pronounced exactly like 'Harry.' Some other speakers, if I am not mistaken, suppress the glide, but lengthen and raise the accented vowel, which then has a sound between *æ* and *e*; this *hæri* is often hard to distinguish from *hæri*. Moreover, I have reason to believe that many Southerners who substitute *yē* for final *ir* keep this *yē* in derivatives: 'fear' = *fyē*, 'fearing' = *fyērin*.

Now, the groups 'er' or 'ear,' 'ar' or 'air' before a vowel occur also in certain words that are not derived from forms in *-iər*, *-æər*: familiar examples are 'Erie,' 'herald,' 'Mary,' 'Marion.' For some of these words the pronunciation is regularly *er*, *ær*: 'heron,' 'very,'=*herən*, *veri*; 'baron,' 'claret'=*bærən*, *klærət*.<sup>2</sup> The others are exceedingly variable: we may have, on the one hand, *ir*, *êr*, as in *wiri*, *pêrant* ('weary,' 'parent,') and, on the other hand, *iər* or *ir*, *æər* or *ær* or *ēr* or *ær*, as in *wiəri* or *wiri*, *pæərənt* or *pêrənt* or *pærənt*. The first type is the commoner in America, while the forms *iər* and *æər* or *ēr* are preferred in southern England. A few of my American correspondents have noted the influence of the English habit upon their own practice. The variable words may be divided into two categories, paroxytones and propoxytones: in examples of the first class ('dreary,' 'fairy') 'er' or 'ear' is *ir* and *iər* and (more rarely) *ir*, 'ar' or 'air' is *êr* and *ær* and (less frequently) *æər*, and also, in some cases, *ær*; in words of the second class ('period,' 'various') the combinations *iər* and *æər* are very difficult for Americans, and are, I think, always reduced to *ir* and *ær* by speakers who use the glide in paroxytones.<sup>3</sup>

The general percentages for the 'er' or 'ear' words are as follows:—

	<i>ir</i>	<i>iər</i> <sup>4</sup>		<i>ir</i>	<i>iər</i> <sup>4</sup>
Nero	88	12	material	70	30
zero	88	12	Erie	68	32
hero	87	13	imperious	68	32
chimera	81	19	period	68	32
era	81	19	query	62	38
peri	80	20	aerial	60	40
Erin	79	21	aerie	57	43
series	78	22	O'Leary	40	60
coherent	77	23	weary	40	60
superior	72	28	dreary	35	65
serious	71	29			

It will be noted that the propoxytones (only

<sup>2</sup> In America 'Clara' (*klærə*) belongs to this class.

<sup>3</sup> In southern England *iər* in these cases tends to become *yər* or *yêr*: 'material'=*metyariəl*, 'experience'=*ikspyəriəns*.

<sup>4</sup> Also *ir*.

a few samples of which were given) group themselves together, ranging between 72-28 and 60-40; the strongest support for *ir* in these cases comes from the North and West. In New York City and in southern Ohio there seems to be a preference for *iər* or *ir* in nearly all the words. In 'dreary,' 'weary,' and 'O'Leary,' where the spelling 'ear' seems to suggest a glide, *iər* or *ir* prevails everywhere: the distinction between these words and all the others is most marked in the South and in E. N. E.; in the West it is scarcely noticeable. The South has by far the largest proportion of votes for *ir* in all the words except 'aerie' and the three just mentioned: my correspondents in Tennessee, Kentucky, and eastern and western Virginia are unanimous for *ir* in most of the examples; and all the votes from the Carolinas are in favor of *ir* for the entire list.

Here are the general percentages for the examples of 'ar' or 'air.' In the case of propoxytones only a few typical words were presented.

	<i>êr</i>	<i>æər</i> or <i>ær</i>	<i>ær</i>
Pharaoh	80	19	1
vagary	78	19	3
vegetarian	77	23	0
Ariel	76	21	3
precarious	76	22	2
Sarah	76	21	3
Mary	75	24	1
vary	74	24	2
Cary	72	24	4
various	72	26	2
harem	69	23	8
eyry	68	31	1
faro	68	21	11
wary	63	33	4
Clary	62	26	12
chary	60	32	8
dairy	60	39	1
caret	57	16	27
prairie	54	44	2
parent	40	37	23
Aaron	35	36	29
garish	33	44	23
fairy	26	61	13
apparent	24	30	46

In this list, as in the other, the propoxytones cling together: they vary between 77-23-0 and



72-26-2. Here, again, E. N. E. and the South agree in opposing the glide: the pronunciation of these two regions, and particularly that of E. N. E., favors *ɛr* in proparoxytones and also in 'harem,' 'Mary,' 'Pharaoh,' 'Sarah,' 'vagary,' 'vary'; E. N. E. has, moreover, a decided preference for *ɛr* in 'caret,' 'Cary,' 'faro.' Nearly all the votes for *færð* and very many of those for *kærət* come from the South, which, furthermore, joins with the rest of the country in preferring *ær* in 'apparent.' 'Aaron' with *ær* is uncommon in the South; it is especially popular in E. N. E. Most of the support for *ærr* in the greater part of the examples comes from the Middle States and Ohio, where *ær* is comparatively rare; New York City strongly favors *ærr* in nearly all the words. On the other hand, the Carolinas, Kentucky, Tennessee, and eastern and western Virginia send almost no votes for *ærr*. It is to be noted that *ær* or *ærr* is the general choice in 'fairy,' and has very many advocates in 'garish,' 'prairie,' 'dairy,' 'parent,' and 'Aaron': in 'dairy,' 'fairy,' 'prairie' the sound may be due to the spelling 'ai,' which suggests to the mind something different from the vowel represented by simple 'a'; in 'Aaron,' 'garish,' 'parent' *ærr* may be the result of a compromise between *ɛr* and *ær*. One correspondent in Indiana pronounces 'Mary' exactly like 'merry'; one in Illinois has *e* in all the words except 'harem'; and one in Ontario has the same vowel in 'Mary,' 'Sarah,' 'vagary,' 'various,' 'vary,' 'vegetarian,' 'wary.'

#### 4. 'HAUNT,' 'LAUNCH,' 'LAUNDRY,' ETC.

The fifth question on my circular related to certain words containing 'au' (in the case of 'stanch' now written 'a') followed by 'nch,' 'nd,' or 'nt.' To my list might have been added 'maunder,' 'Saunders,' 'taunt,' and, perhaps, 'Chauncy.'<sup>5</sup> It is a noteworthy fact that 'aunt' does not belong to this series. These words show, in addition to the pronunciations *a* and *æ*, which are given to such forms as 'ant' and 'branch,' a third type, *ɔ*, which prevails in a large part of our country. The dialect boundaries are not quite the same for this case as for those we have considered

<sup>5</sup> I should be glad to receive information about the pronunciation of these words.

hitherto: W. N. E. goes with E. N. E. rather than with the Middle States. The percentages are as follows:—

	N. E.			NORTH, <sup>6</sup> WEST			SOUTH		
	ɔ	a	æ	ɔ	a	æ	ɔ	a	æ
craunch	43	57	0	79	18	3	66	24	0
daunt	17	83	0	76	21	3	59	31	10
flaunt	22	78	0	76	21	3	67	26	7
gaunt	14	86	0	72	23	5	54	29	17
gauntlet	11	89	0	71	25	4	52	29	19
haunch	29	71	0	77	20	3	64	29	7
haunt	24	76	0	75	19	6	50	31	19
jaunt	17	83	0	69	25	6	50	31	19
jaundice	29	71	0	73	24	3	61	29	10
launch	14	84	2	64	28	8	52	29	19
laundry	48	52	0	87	13	0	64	26	0
paunch	73	27	0	89	10	1	88	12	0
saunter	33	67	0	86	11	3	55	31	14
stanch	11	89	0	33	43	24	19	21	60
vaunt	29	71	0	58	15	0	71	24	5

Most of the votes for *a* in the North and West come from New York City, northern Ohio, and Michigan; in the West there are very few cases of *a*, except in 'stanch'; in Illinois there are none. No example of *a* has been reported from Tennessee. Nearly all the Southern support of *a* comes from the eastern (and, in a measure, from the central and northern) part of Virginia. I am told on good authority that the old whig families in Virginia say *ɔ*, while the democratic ones pronounce *æ*; the use of *a* is probably due to school influence, which several of my correspondents mention in connection with this list. In the Gulf States the vulgar pronunciation for most of the words is said to be *æ*; this is doubtless true of almost all the South and of a part, at least, of the North and West; *æ* in 'gaunt,' 'gauntlet,' 'haunt,' 'jaundice,' 'launch,' 'stanch' is popular in northern Ohio.

For the sake of convenience I added to the above list, on my circular, the word 'Chicago.' The results are given below:—

	N. E.		NORTH, <sup>7</sup> WEST		SOUTH	
	ɔ	a	ɔ	a	ɔ	a
Chicago	75	25	67	33	33	67

The West is more inclined to *a* than the North; *ɔ* is particularly strong in the Middle States.

C. H. GRANDGENT.

Cambridge, Mass.

<sup>6</sup> Not including W. N. E.

<sup>7</sup> Not including W. N. E.

## GEORGE SAND.

IL y a eu au xix<sup>e</sup> siècle, il y a encore, un grand nombre de femmes auteurs en France, mais aucune ne nous intéresse autant que George Sand, aucune n'a produit des figures aussi poétiques, aucune ne nous a touché autant par ses innombrables créations. Quand on pense à tout ce que cette femme a écrit, à tout ce que ce merveilleux cerveau a imaginé, à cette œuvre immense accomplie avec un courage si ferme et un cœur si droit, on est réellement émerveillé. Travailler pendant près de cinquante ans sans jamais se lasser, renouveler son génie en le mettant dans d'autres voies, trouver le temps d'être bonne mère et de s'occuper des malheureux, tâcher de réformer la société, voilà ce que fit cette femme célèbre qui s'appela George Sand.

Aurore Dupin descendait du maréchal de Saxe, qui, lui-même, était fils d'Auguste, électeur de Saxe et roi de Pologne, et de la belle comtesse de Königsmark. Son grand-père, Dupin de Francueil, était fermier général, son père, officier dans l'armée française. Du côté paternel elle appartenait donc à l'aristocratie, sa mère était du peuple. Ce mélange permet d'expliquer comment elle a su comprendre si bien les mœurs de la haute société, des marquises de Villemere, et celles des pastoures, des petites Maries et des Fadettes. Maurice Dupin épousa en 1804 une femme d'une classe inférieure, et en juillet de la même année naquit sa fille Aurore. La vieille Mme. Dupin reçut alors chez elle, à Nohant, son fils et sa femme. Nohant est situé non loin de La Châtre, dans le Berry, cette province dont George Sand a décrit avec tant d'amour les mœurs paisibles des habitants, leurs superstitions, leur peur de la *lavandière*, de la *grand'bête*, des fées de tous genres, le pays des petits cours d'eau, des champs fertiles, des bois touffus et des traînes mystérieuses.

En 1808 Maurice Dupin se tua en tombant de cheval, et la petite Aurore, âgée de quatre ans, fut réclamée par la mère et par la grand'mère. Ce fut celle-ci qui l'emporta, car la fille du maréchal de Saxe n'estimait pas sa bru et ne crut pas qu'elle pût bien élever l'enfant. La mère n'avait aucune fortune et se

soumit. Pendant quelque temps on lui envoya sa fille à Paris pour que la séparation ne fût pas trop brusque, mais on finit par garder l'enfant entièrement à Nohant. Elle eut un précepteur, M. Deschartres, et eut du goût pour l'étude, mais elle fut en réalité livrée à elle-même et partagea tous les jeux des petits paysans. Lorsqu'elle eut treize ans sa grand'mère l'envoya au couvent des Anglaises à Paris. Elle a raconté d'une manière charmante les incidents de sa vie d'écolière, comment elle fut d'abord parmi les *diabes*, qui organisaient de grandes expéditions pour libérer les prisonnières qui devaient être enfouies dans quelque cachot souterrain, comment elle eut un accès de dévotion, de mysticisme plutôt, et voulut se faire religieuse. On la retira du couvent quand elle eut quinze ans et elle revint à Nohant, où elle partagea son temps entre les soins à donner à sa grand'mère infirme, la lecture et la vie en plein air. Elle étudia les philosophes, les poètes, s'occupa même d'anatomie, monta à cheval avec intrépidité, apprit à tirer du pistolet et alla à la chasse. Elle s'habillait quelquefois en homme pour pouvoir se livrer plus facilement à son goût pour la chasse et l'on commença dès lors à exagérer ses excentricités et à la calomnier. Quand elle eut dix-sept ans sa grand'mère mourut, lui laissant Nohant et la confiant à des parents éloignés. La jeune fille, cependant, alla retrouver à Paris sa mère qu'elle avait continué à aimer; mais, dans un milieu inférieur et près d'une mère fantasque et irritable, Aurore Dupin ne fut pas heureuse. Elle alla passer quelque temps chez des amis, les Duplessis, à Melun, et ce fut là qu'elle rencontra le baron Casimir Dudevant qu'elle épousa à l'âge de dix-huit ans. Il en avait vingt-sept, avait une certaine aisance et de bonnes manières, cela paraissait donc un bon *mariage de raison*.

M. et Mme. Dudevant s'établirent à Nohant et eurent deux enfants, Maurice en 1823, et Solange en 1828. M. Dudevant ne savait pas qu'il avait épousé une femme de génie, mais tel étant le cas, son rôle de mari fut difficile à remplir, et il n'y eut aucune sympathie entre sa femme et lui. Désirant être indépendante, Mme. Dudevant fit avec son mari en 1830 un étrange compromis. Il fut convenu qu'elle irait chercher fortune à

Paris avec sa fille, que son fils resterait avec le père, qu'on lui allouerait trois mille francs par an pour subsister à Paris, et que tous les trois mois elle reviendrait à Nohant pour y passer trois mois et s'occuper de Maurice.

Voilà donc Mme. Dudevant à Paris en janvier 1831. Que va-t-elle faire pour gagner sa vie? Elle essaie d'abord de la peinture, mais réussit médiocrement, ensuite Henri de Latouche, Berrichon comme elle, et fondateur du *Figaro*, la prend à son journal, où elle écrit des articles à cinq francs la colonne. Ce n'était pas là son genre, car elle ne pouvait dire en une colonne tout ce qu'elle pensait. De Latouche s'en aperçut et lui conseilla de se tourner vers le roman. Elle avait rencontré à Paris un jeune homme de sa province qu'elle connaissait, Jules Sandeau. Elle se lia avec lui et ils écrivirent ensemble et publièrent, sous le nom de Jules Sand, un roman, 'Rose et Blanche,' qui eut un certain succès.

Au commencement de son séjour à Paris, Mme. Dudevant se trouva très gênée, et par raison d'économie et pour être plus libre d'aller où il lui plairait, elle reprit le costume d'homme qu'elle avait porté avant son mariage pour ses expéditions dans les champs. Elle put alors parcourir avec les étudiants le quartier Latin sans être reconnue. Elle ne se livra pas, cependant, à la débauche, comme on l'a prétendu, mais elle devint le camarade de la jeunesse littéraire et artistique du temps. Elle fut toujours très laborieuse et animée du désir d'acquiescer cette indépendance qu'elle chérissait. Pendant le temps qu'elle passait à Nohant, selon l'arrangement conclu avec son mari, elle écrivit un roman qu'elle fit lire à Sandeau. L'éditeur tenait au nom de Sand, à cause du succès de 'Rose et Blanche,' alors de Latouche suggéra que Mme. Dudevant gardât le nom de Sand, et y ajoutât celui de George, synonyme de Berrichon. C'est ainsi que naquit *George Sand*, l'auteur d'*Indiana*.

'Indiana' parut à la fin d'avril 1832, et eut un succès dont l'auteur fut étonné et qui rendit son nom célèbre. On vit que la France possédait un grand romancier de plus et on lut le livre avec enthousiasme. C'est un roman d'amour, écrit d'un style passionné et éloquent, avec une grande amertume, non contre le mariage même, mais, selon les vues de l'auteur,

contre le mariage tel que l'a organisé la société, c'est-à-dire sans l'amour, la seule base réelle.

On lit 'Indiana' avec un certain intérêt et on a pitié de la pauvre femme, livrée à un mari brutal, mais on ne peut admirer Raymon qui nous paraît insignifiant et lâche, et Ralph, le sauveur d'Indiana, est un personnage impossible. Quelque heureux qu'il soit dans sa *chaumière indienne* avec son Indiana, nous ne pouvons louer sa conduite et partager son mépris pour les lois de la société. George Sand, elle-même, crut parfois pouvoir braver l'opinion publique et agir selon sa fantaisie, mais ce n'est pas alors qu'elle fut heureuse. Lorsqu'à la fin de 1833, elle partait pour l'Italie avec Alfred de Musset, elle crut avoir trouvé le bonheur, mais après quelques mois, le poète la quittait, et elle revenait désenchantée retrouver ses enfants.

En 1836, elle obtint une séparation légale de son mari et fixa sa résidence à Nohant. C'est là qu'elle fut heureuse, quand fatiguée des aventures romanesques, elle mena la vie d'une mère de famille digne et aimée. Elle put continuer à écrire, à recevoir ses amis, et elle vieillit doucement, heureuse d'être grand-mère, fière de ses petites-filles, entourée de l'amour et du respect des siens. C'est là qu'est le vrai bonheur, c'est dans la famille, telle que l'a constituée la société en établissant le mariage. S'il arrive que le mariage soit sans amour, il vaut mieux se résigner à le supporter, car, en le brisant, on court le risque de détruire la famille, sur laquelle, en réalité, repose la société. George Sand, à notre avis, se trompa dans 'Indiana,' dans 'Valentine,' dans 'Lélia,' mais elle sut plus tard racheter cette erreur et écrivit des œuvres pures, gracieuses et poétiques, qui nous font considérer ses premiers romans comme une étude intéressante de style plutôt que comme des ouvrages à théories sociales. 'Valentine' nous plaît aussi par la description du Berry, par cet amour de la nature, que nous aurons tant à louer plus tard dans ces adorables idylles, 'la Mare au Diable,' 'François le Champi' et 'la Petite Fadette.'

En étudiant les œuvres de George Sand, il faut se rappeler que cette femme à l'aspect tranquille, qui parle peu, qui paraît presque

insignifiante au premier abord, est douée d'une imagination immense, et que dans ses livres elle ne se représente jamais telle qu'elle est. 'Lélia' est un poème en prose, c'est un cri qu'a poussé l'auteur dans un moment de souffrance, mais ce n'est pas réellement elle. Elle était essentiellement bonne, avait beaucoup de bon sens et était simple et modeste. Là où elle dépeint le mieux certains sentiments qu'elle a pu éprouver à certaines époques c'est dans 'Lucrezia Floriani' et dans les premières 'Lettres d'un Voyageur,' après la rupture avec Alfred de Musset. Nous savons que nous devons à cet événement 'la Confession d'Un Enfant du Siècle,' les admirables "Nuits" du poète et son "Merle Blanc," raillerie spirituelle à laquelle répondit George Sand, beaucoup plus tard, par 'Elle et Lui.'

L'immense succès d' 'Indiana' et de 'Valentine' avait ouvert à l'auteur la *Revue des Deux Mondes*, et elle acquit enfin cette indépendance pécuniaire à laquelle elle avait aspiré. Dès ce moment les romans se succèdent sous sa plume avec la plus grande rapidité. Elle écrit d'un jet, sans se relire, sans faire de ratures; elle ne fait pas de plan, les idées semblent suivre sa plume et viennent se ranger docilement sur le papier. Son imagination est si grande que son histoire se crée toute seule, sans efforts, sans réflexion, et ses personnages se modifient à son gré, comme dans la vie elle-même, mais quelquefois sans assez de logique. Elle écrit sans lever, pour ainsi dire, la plume du papier, de dix heures du soir à cinq heures du matin, et son excellente constitution lui permet de supporter ce labeur extraordinaire jusqu'à l'âge de soixante-douze ans. Elle a écrit un si grand nombre de volumes qu'on peut à peine les mentionner. Citons cependant, après 'Lélia,' qui parut en 1834, 'Jacques' (1834), 'André,' 'Leone Leoni' (1835), 'Simon' (1836), enfin 'Mauprat' (1837). Ce dernier ouvrage appartient à la première manière de George Sand, c'est du lyrisme, de la passion, mais le but est noble, c'est de montrer que l'amour pur et vrai peut réhabiliter l'homme presque abruti. Bernard de Mauprat appartient à une famille de bandits, et dans le donjon féodal de son grand-père il assiste à toutes sortes de crimes. Il avait eu de bons sentiments, mais l'exemple de ses

oncles a étouffé toute générosité en lui et il est devenu un animal sauvage. Un soir Edmée, sa cousine, la fille de Mauprat *Casse-tête*, est conduite dans le repaire des Mauprat *Coupe-jarret*. Bernard la sauve, après lui avoir fait promettre de l'épouser, et il va demeurer chez le père d'Edmée. Nous assistons ici à des scènes touchantes et intéressantes, où Bernard qui aime passionnément sa cousine, lutte contre ses instincts grossiers et tâche de se rendre digne d'elle, et où celle-ci, avec un tact admirable, apprivoise le sauvage et lui rend une âme. Elle en fait un homme de cœur dont l'amour est profond et constant. Il va en Amérique, combat pour la cause de l'indépendance, reste fidèle à celle qu'il aime et espère qu'Edmée sera touchée de sa constance. Elle veut encore l'éprouver, mais elle est frappée par un Mauprat *Coupe-jarret*, et Bernard est accusé de se crime. Edmée déclare alors l'amour qu'elle ressent, depuis tant d'années pour lui, il est acquitté, il l'épouse, et à l'âge de quatre-vingts ans, il s'écrie en racontant son histoire :

"Elle fut la seule femme que j'aimai dans toute ma vie; jamais aucune autre n'attira mon regard et ne connut l'étreinte de ma main."

'Mauprat' est un beau livre, malgré l'in vraisemblance des caractères. Nous les aimons, cependant, ces deux nobles cœurs, Bernard et Edmée, ainsi que Marcasse, le preneur de taupes, et même Patience, ce paysan trop philosophe, ce rustique Jean-Jacques.

George Sand était l'amie de presque toutes les célébrités qui se réunissaient à Paris: Henri Heine, Mickiewicz, Gustave Planche, Lamennais, Béranger, Eugène Delacroix, Meyerbeer, Liszt et Chopin. Plus tard elle eut beaucoup d'autres amis parmi les grands artistes et les grands écrivains, et elle fut surtout affectueuse pour Gustave Flaubert qu'elle consolait avec douceur.

Nous avons nommé Chopin parmi les amis de George Sand. Pendant longtemps il fut un des plus intimes, et lorsque la santé de Maurice fit penser à un voyage à l'étranger, Chopin accompagna la mère et les enfants. Ils crurent trouver un climat idéal à Majorque et y passèrent l'hiver de 1838. Ils n'eurent guère à se louer de l'île et de ses habitants.



Ceux-ci furent inhospitaliers, et des pluies incessantes forcèrent les voyageurs à passer de longs mois dans un monastère abandonné. Le grand musicien faillit mourir à Majorque et sa compagne le soigna avec dévouement. Ils travaillèrent tous deux dans la vieille chartreuse de Valdemosa; Chopin y écrivit ses "Préludes" et George Sand, 'Spiridion,' histoire d'un jeune moine. L'influence de Chopin dut être grande sur son amie et c'est probablement à cette intimité que nous devons 'Consuelo' (1842). Il y a beaucoup de belles pages dans ce roman, et le caractère de Consuelo est admirable, mais on se perd dans la multiplicité des incidents, et dans la 'Comtesse de Rudolstadt' on ne comprend plus rien. Tout est si mystique et sombre qu'on voit à peine que l'auteur a une thèse et qu'elle veut parler des sociétés secrètes. Les thèses, les systèmes, voilà ce qui gâte pendant plusieurs années, les œuvres de George Sand. Elle avait fait la connaissance de Michel (de Bourges), de Pierre Leroux, de Barbès, et elle s'imagina qu'elle était appelée à plaider la cause des malheureux. Elle écrivit alors des romans de la deuxième manière, des romans socialistes, 'Horace,' 'le Compagnon du Tour de France,' 'le Pêché de M. Antoine,' 'le Meunier d'Angibault,' œuvres généralement ennuyeuses et remplies d'idées chimériques. Dans son enthousiasme pour la cause du peuple, George Sand crut avoir des idées politiques et joua un rôle à la Révolution de Février. Elle offrit ses services à Ledru-Rollin et écrivit vaillamment pour soutenir les idées républicaines et le gouvernement provisoire. Les émeutes de Juin la découragèrent et le Coup d'Etat la fit renoncer à jamais à la politique. Elle intercédait, cependant, près de Louis-Napoléon, en faveur d'un grand nombre de ses amis, et agit avec courage et dévouement.

Pendant que George Sand produisait ses romans à thèses, elle écrivit en 1846 'la Mare au Diable,' où elle inaugura sa troisième manière, l'idylle poétique et pure, sans souci de systèmes d'aucun genre. Déjà dans 'Jeanne' (1844), elle était revenue aux scènes champêtres et avait fait d'admirables descriptions de la campagne. Nous nous intéressons infiniment à l'héroïne du roman,

cette jeune fille que nous rencontrons endormie près des pierres Jomâtres, et à qui les trois jeunes gens font des souhaits en mettant chacun une pièce de monnaie dans sa main. Nous admirons la douceur, la fierté de Jeanne, mais bientôt la jeune fille des champs devient trop, comme on l'a dit, une Jeanne d'Arc et une Velléda, et sa mort nous touche moins que si elle fût restée simple pastoure comme la petite Marie de 'la Mare au Diable.' Voilà un véritable chef-d'œuvre, cette simple histoire de Germain, le fin laboureur, c'est une géorgique qui serait unique dans la littérature française, si nous n'avions pas aussi 'François le Champi' et 'la Petite Fadette.'

L'auteur nous fait d'abord la description du tableau d'Holbein représentant la mort courant à côté d'un vieux laboureur en haillons qui conduit un attelage maigre et exténué, dans un champ stérile. Nous voyons ensuite le contraste de cette scène: c'est un homme jeune et vigoureux conduisant une charrue traînée par quatre paires de bœufs splendides qu'aiguillonne un jeune garçon frais et rosé. Il n'y a rien de plus gracieux que cette description du labour et nous aimons Germain, rien qu'à le voir si gai à son travail et jetant des regards d'amour sur son fils, le petit Pierre. Nous écoutons avec intérêt la conversation de Germain et de son beau-père qui l'engage à se remarier et qui l'envoie trouver la Catherine, riche veuve, qui demeure à Fourche. Germain part sur la Grise ayant en croupe la petite Marie qui va se placer au village voisin. Elle a déjà seize ans, mais Germain ne l'a jamais regardée et la considère comme une enfant. Sur la route ils prennent le petit Pierre, et la Grise ne s'aperçoit pas du fardeau qu'elle porte.

"En passant devant le pré-long, elle aperçut sa mère, qui s'appelait la vieille Grise, comme elle la jeune Grise, et elle hennit en signe d'adieu. La vieille Grise s'approcha de la haie en faisant résonner ses enherges, essaya de galoper sur la marge du pré pour suivre sa fille; puis, la voyant prendre le grand trot, elle hennit à son tour, et resta pensive, inquiète, le nez au vent, la bouche pleine d'herbes qu'elle ne songeait plus à manger."

Comme ces lignes sont naturelles et vraies, ainsi que la conversation entre Germain et la petite Marie. Celle-ci a eu tant de prévoy-

ance, elle s'est montrée si douce pour le petit Pierre que le fin laboureur se prend à l'aimer et lui demande de l'épouser. Marie lui répond avec sagesse qu'elle est trop pauvre et trop jeune pour lui qui a vingt-huit ans, et pendant qu'ils sont égarés dans les bois qui entourent la mare au Diable, elle fait du feu, prépare le souper pour le père et l'enfant et s'endort tranquillement, après avoir endormi petit Pierre et lui avoir fait dire sa prière. Au jour Germain reconnaît la route et il se rend à Fourche chez la Catherine, et Marie accompagnée de petit Pierre, va aux Ormeaux chez son nouveau maître. La description de la coquette de village, a qui tout le monde fait la cour et qui ne se décide pour aucun des prétendants afin d'avoir le plaisir de les conserver tous, est très amusante. Germain ne peut se décider à ce rôle de soupirant et s'en retourne bien triste en pensant à la petite Marie. Il la rencontre en route fuyant le fermier grossier chez qui elle devait travailler. Il punit le maître brutal et indigne et il ramène la petite Marie chez elle. De retour chez son beau-père Germain se remet au travail, mais il ne rit plus, il ne cause plus, et lorsque sa belle-mère, la mère Maurice, lui demande ce qu'il fera s'il ne peut se guérir de son amour, il répond :

"Toute chose a son terme, mère Maurice : quand le cheval est trop chargé, il tombe, et quand le bœuf n'a rien à manger, il meurt."

La vieille l'engage alors à aller voir encore une fois la petite Marie, et la conversation entre eux a tant de charme que nous tenons à en citer la fin :

"Germain parlait comme dans un rêve sans entendre ce qu'il disait. La petite Marie tremblait toujours, mais comme il tremblait encore davantage, il ne s'en apercevait plus. Tout à coup elle se retourna ; elle était tout en larmes et le regardait d'un air de reproche. Le pauvre laboureur crut que c'était le dernier coup, et, sans attendre son arrêt, il se leva pour partir ; mais la jeune fille l'arrêta en l'entourant de ses deux bras, et cachant sa tête dans son sein : — Ah ! Germain, lui dit-elle en sanglotant, vous n'avez donc pas deviné que je vous aime ? "

Les noces du fin laboureur et de la petite Marie se firent avec grandes réjouissances et l'on n'oublia en les célébrant aucune des coutumes du pays. Ce petit roman est un pur

joyau et nous devons remercier l'auteur de n'avoir obéi qu'à sa poétique imagination et au sentiment de la nature.

Nous trouvons le même charme dans 'la Petite Fadette' (1848), et 'François le Champi' (1850). Y a-t-il rien de plus intéressant que l'amitié des deux bessons, Landry et Sylvinet, l'un fort et courageux, l'autre faible et doux et jaloux de la Petite Fadette ? C'est une charmante fille, cette Fanchon Fadet, elle a grand cœur et grand sens ; elle était trop garçon, trop indifférente à la toilette quand elle chantait de sa petite voix douce :

"Fadet, fadet, petit fadet,  
Prends ta chandelle et ton cornet :  
J'ai pris ma cape et mon capet,  
Toute follette a son follet."

L'amour qu'elle éprouve pour Landry la transforme en une jeune fille modeste, et le père Barbeau est heureux de lui donner son fils quand il apprend qu'elle est devenue belle, réservée et riche. Quant à Sylvinet il est d'abord désespéré du mariage de son besson, mais la petite Fadette le guérit et il part comme soldat, car

"Notre Fanchon, dit la mère Barbeau, est trop grande charmeuse, et tellement qu'elle avait charmé Sylvinet plus qu'elle ne l'aurait souhaité."

François le Champi, l'enfant trouvé, nous intéresse autant que Germain, le fin laboureur, et Landry, le besson. Quelle gratitude il éprouve pour Madeleine Blanchet, quel amour pour elle et son petit Jeannie ! Comme il est courageux quand il faut lui venir en aide, et comme il tremble quand il veut lui demander d'être sa femme, cependant

"Il faut croire qu'il parla très bien et que Madeleine n'y trouva rien à répondre, car ils y étaient encore à minuit, et elle pleurait de joie, et il la remerciait à deux genoux de ce qu'elle l'acceptait pour son mari."

Lorsqu'on parle de George Sand on se rappelle trop l'auteur d'Indiana parcourant le quartier Latin en habits d'homme ; on devrait voir un peu plus la châtelaine de Nohant et ne pas oublier ce qu'elle dit d'elle-même :

"L'individu nommé George Sand cueille des fleurs, classe ses herbes, coud des robes et des manteaux pour son petit monde, et des costumes de marionnettes, lit de la musique,

mais surtout passe des heures avec ses petits-enfants."

Voilà le portrait d'une bonne vieille grand-mère et non pas de 'Lélia.'

"Elle a été souverainement gracieuse et aimable," dit M. Emile Faguet, "depuis qu'elle a perdu l'habitude de se déguiser en homme."

Les œuvres, à partir de 'François le Champi' (1850), continuèrent à être gracieuses et aimables. C'est une quatrième manière, mais qui tient à la troisième, ce sont encore des idylles, mais les scènes ne sont pas toutes rustiques. Citons 'les Maîtres Sonneurs,' admirable ouvrage que l'on peut comparer à 'la Mare au Diable,' 'Valvèdre,' 'l'Homme de Neige,' la 'Confession d'une jeune fille,' 'Mademoiselle Merquem,' 'Jean de la Roche,' 'Mont-Revéche,' et prenons comme types des œuvres de la dernière manière, 'les Beaux Messieurs de Bois-Doré' et le 'Marquis de Villemer.'

Transportons-nous au commencement du xvii<sup>e</sup> siècle, soyons un moment contemporains de Louis XIII, de Luynes, de Richelieu, du troisième Condé, lisons l'*'Astrée'* avec eux, prenons notre épée et nos pistolets et allons en Berry. Là, non loin du gigantesque château de Condé, nous trouverons un petit castel seigneurial, c'est la demeure de M. le marquis de Bois-Doré. Compagnon fidèle du Béarnais, celui-ci a donné un titre à un gentilhomme de petite noblesse qui, dans une excursion, a su trouver une poule pour le souper de son roi affamé. M. de Bois-Doré s'est enrichi à la guerre, mais il est essentiellement bon, et surtout chevaleresque, et ses vassaux l'adorent. Il a tant lu l'*'Astrée'* qu'il connaît par cœur le chef-d'œuvre de d'Urfé et il s'imaginerait être resté jeune, quoiqu'il soit né sous le règne d'Henri II. Son fidèle Adamas lui fait tous les jours une toilette mystérieuse: il lui met une perruque blonde, du rouge sur les joues, des habits de soie tout couverts de rubans, tels qu'en portent les jeunes seigneurs de la cour, et le beau marquis de Bois-Doré part dans son lourd carrosse pour rendre visite à sa voisine, Lauriane de Beuvre, jeune veuve de quatorze ans. M. le marquis veut se marier et demande la main de Lauriane qui lui dit d'être constant pendant sept ans et qu'elle lui donnera réponse. Pendant ce

temps une Morisque et un petit garçon arrivent au château de Bois-Doré et le marquis découvre que l'enfant est le fils de son frère disparu depuis longtemps. Il apprend aussi que l'assassin de son frère est son hôte, l'élégant cavalier, M. d'Alvimar. Il accompagne celui-ci sur la grande route et là, en présence de son parent, Guillaume d'Ars, il donne un grand coup d'épée à M. d'Alvimar. Il reconnaît alors son neveu, il le fait habiller comme lui, il le mène rendre visite aux seigneurs du voisinage, et partout où ils passent chacun court pour admirer les beaux messieurs de Bois-Doré.

Le père de Lauriane va rejoindre les huguenotes de la Rochelle et elle vient demeurer chez le marquis, qui ne pense plus à l'épouser depuis qu'il a trouvé un héritier. Là ils sont heureux quelque temps, et Mario de Bois-Doré reçoit les leçons du savant Lucilio, ancien compagnon du célèbre Bruno, et torturé avec lui. Le petit garçon est beau et gracieux, dévoué et brave, et quand le château de son oncle est assiégé par les reîtres du capitaine Macabre et par les Bohémiens, il se bat fort bien et sauve la vie de son oncle. Il grandit et aime la gentille Lauriane, mais celle-ci le trouve trop jeune et ils sont séparés pendant plusieurs années. Nous revoyons Mario, à l'âge de dix-neuf ans, combattant au Pas de Suze dans l'armée de Louis XIII et se faisant bienvenir du cardinal. Le vieux marquis de Bois-Doré est toujours à côté de son neveu au plus fort du danger, et nous les retrouvons encore ensemble, lorsque Lauriane consent à devenir la femme de son ami d'enfance. 'Les Beaux Messieurs de Bois-Doré' est une œuvre exquise et nous regrettons que George Sand n'ait pas écrit plus de romans historiques. Elle ne se contente pas de raconter un grand nombre d'aventures extraordinaires, mais elle se pénètre de l'esprit de l'époque et fait parler ses personnages comme on parlait de leur temps. Elle fait un portrait frappant du père du grand Condé, cet homme rapace, incompetent et vil, indigne de son grand-père, le compagnon d'Henri IV, et de son fils, le vainqueur de Rocroy. Citons quelques lignes pour faire voir le style historique de George Sand:

"Le roi et le cardinal gravissaient la montagne en dépit d'un froid rigoureux. On

hissait le canon à travers les neiges. C'était une de ces grandes scènes que le soldat français a toujours su si bien jouer dans le cadre grandiose des Alpes, sous Napoléon comme sous Richelieu, et sous Richelieu comme sous Louis XIII, sans s'amuser à faire dissoudre les roches, comme on l'attribue au génie d'Annibal, et sans employer d'autre artifice que la volonté, l'ardeur et la gaieté intrépides."

Nous ne voulons pas faire ici l'analyse du 'Marquis de Villemer,' nous désirons appeler l'attention sur l'observation exacte des manières du grand monde, sur les conversations si intéressantes entre la vieille marquise, spirituelle et bonne mais entichée de sa noblesse, et Caroline de St. Geneix, si loyale, si belle et si énergique. Les caractères des deux frères sont bien tracés, le duc d'Aléria, débauché mais cœur bon, et le marquis de Villemer, savant, désintéressé, délicat. Caroline se fait aimer du marquis sans le vouloir, mais le fuit pour qu'il ne désobéisse pas à sa mère. Elle quitte Paris et se réfugie dans le Velay, dont l'auteur fait une agréable description. On y voit le grand château de Polignac, on y rencontre le paysan taciturne et honnête, on suit le marquis dans sa course à travers la neige, on le voit tomber, on le croit perdu, mais non, Caroline ne peut plus résister à son amour, elle sauve celui qu'elle aime, elle veut partager sa vie, et la vieille marquise consent à leur mariage.

Dans 'le Marquis de Villemer' George Sand fait une fine étude psychologique et raconte une charmante histoire d'amour. Nous voudrions pouvoir parler encore de quelques autres de ses romans que nous avons lus avec tant de plaisir, des 'Maîtres Mosaïstes,' de 'Teverino,' du 'Château des Désertes.' Nous dirons seulement qu'en lisant le 'Château des Désertes' on peut se rendre compte du grand amour de George Sand pour le théâtre. Elle aimerait à jouer ses pièces avec mystère, la nuit, quand les passants sont intrigués par le bruit des voix, par la lumière qui filtre à travers les volets mal fermés. En réalité, cependant, c'est devant tous ses amis qu'elle joue à Nohant, avec son fils et ses intimes, les pièces qu'elle a composées, simples marionnettes quelquefois. Elle écrivit beaucoup pour le théâtre, mais sans grand succès. On joue encore, néanmoins, 'le mariage de Vic-

torine,' inspiré par 'le Philosophe sans le savoir' de Sedaine, et 'le Marquis de Villemer.'

En 1869 George Sand disait qu'elle avait gagné avec sa plume un million de francs, mais qu'elle n'avait mis de côté que vingt mille francs pour acheter de la tisane, si elle était malade. Elle était très généreuse et, bonne patriote, elle souffrit beaucoup des malheurs de la France pendant la guerre de 1870. Elle vécut assez longtemps, cependant, pour voir son pays se relever de ses désastres, et ses dernières années furent calmes et heureuses. Elle mourut le 8 juin 1876 et ses derniers mots furent: "Ne touchez pas à la verdure." Son esprit poétique suivait ses gentilles pastoures dans les traînes ombragées et son âme s'envola portée doucement par la petite Marie et la petite Fadette.

ALCÉE FORTIER.

Tulane University of Louisiana.

#### THE ST. ALEXIS LEGEND.

DURING the Middle Ages, both early and late, Alexis was one of the most popular saints, a fact which is attested by the very numerous versions of his life which have come down to us. Even as early as the first quarter of the eighteenth century, investigations into the history of this legend were made by Jean Pien, S. J., and the results published in the 'Acta Sanctorum' of the Bollandists for July 17.

In 1843, Massmann published a small book entitled: 'Sanct Alexius Leben, in acht gereimten mittelhochdeutschen Behandlungen.'<sup>1</sup> In an appendix he gives nine other versions in various languages.

Since this work was issued, various scholars have published versions in other languages not included in Massmann's list, but making little or no progress toward a discovery of the origin of the legend, until M. Arthur Amiaud investigated the Syriac versions, which he published in 1889.<sup>2</sup>

From his investigations it appears that the earliest version of the legend was one written in Syriac in the fifth century. This primitive

<sup>1</sup> *Bibl. d. deutsch. Nat. Lit.*, Abth. I, Bd. 9.

<sup>2</sup> *Bibl. de l'Éc. des hautes études*, fasc. 79.



form of it is hardly recognizable as the parent of the versions which were current ten centuries later, so great have been the changes which the legend underwent in the course of time. This Syriac version seems to be for the most part a sober historical narrative: it relates (basing its narrative upon the accounts of eye-witnesses) the strange life of a man who, from ascetic and religious motives, had mingled with the poor of the church at Edessa, although he was of noble and opulent station; he had left his family in Constantinople in order to embrace this wretched and degraded existence. Similar singularities were far from being without parallel in the fifth century; they edified those who saw them or heard of them, but there was nothing marvelous about them.

This biography was carried to Constantinople and received there entirely new embellishments. Whilst the legend of Edessa said expressly that the "man of God" had died at Edessa, the Greek biographer (or rather romance-writer) supposed that 'Alexis' (hitherto the hero had been anonymous) had come back to Constantinople, that he had presented himself unrecognizable at his father's house, that for long years he had lived with them on their charity, and that only at his death had a miracle caused them to recognize him as their son, and at the same time revealed his extraordinary saintliness. How different has the legend already become by this one step!

It was the same author who introduced the marriage of Alexis, his departure in the night after the wedding and all the rôle of the betrothed.

Composed with art and mingling a profoundly human pathos with sentiments of the most exalted piety, this little romance had a prodigious success, and we can distinguish two separate currents by which it was brought down into modern literatures: the one by way of the various languages of Russia, where it attained to its greatest popularity; the other by way of the Latin, whence it spread into almost all the Romance, Teutonic and south-western Slavonic literatures.

The veneration for St. Alexis had quickly spread throughout the East, but it was

unknown in the West until the end of the tenth century. The archbishop of Damascus Sergius, having taken refuge in Rome at this epoch, was surprised not to find in that city any knowledge of a saint whom Syria (through a misconception) held to have been a Roman. He spread in Rome this marvelous history and it there had the greatest success, being soon attested and confirmed by striking miracles.

Having once entered mediæval Latin literature, the versions of the legend multiplied with surprising rapidity both in Latin and in the other languages of western Europe. It would seem that in any one modern literature these versions usually go back directly to Latin sources, and not to those in some other modern language; and, that within a given literature most of the versions are interrelated, while a few go back to an independent Latin source—a state of affairs which seems quite natural when we consider the part which Latin literature played in the Middle Ages.

Although much has already been done to investigate the St. Alexis legend in various literatures, the work on the legend which remains to be done would seem to be much greater still, and further investigations of this same legend will probably result in bringing to light many interesting bits of mediæval literary history.

So much as an introductory notice; the principal object of the present remarks on the subject is to communicate certain facts concerning the manuscript sources; these facts are for the most part new, and are derived directly from the MSS. themselves.

I would first call attention to what seem to be four *new* versions:

The first of these is another Flemish version (only a single one was previously known); it is contained in the Bibliothèque Royale at Brussels, No. 3072 of MS. 3067-3073, xiv. century, 16mo. It extends over eight folios, and begins thus:

"Dit es sente Alexis legende. Te dien tiden dat Honorius ende Archadius de keyzers regneerden soe was te Rome een groet edel man."<sup>3</sup>

The other three versions are Latin: one of them is found in a MS. of the Stadtbibliothek

<sup>3</sup> My thanks are due M. Ouverleaux for this information.

of Berne, Cod. 710, No. 6, fol. 64 a—72 a, xii. century, in verse. It begins thus:

Incipit vita mirabilis sancti Alexis  
Duxit romanus vir nobilis Eufemianus  
Anglaen uxorem se non ignobiliorem  
Quos exaltatos et honoribus amplificatos.<sup>4</sup>

Another exists in the San Marco library at Venice, cod. 30 membr., saec. xiv, a. 193, l. 119 [Z. L. D. vii]. Ya. fol. 89-92. It begins thus:

Fuit vir Romae magnus et nomine Euphemianus. .<sup>5</sup> The last is found in the same library: cod. 116 membr., saec. xii, a. 449, r. 312 [Z. L. CCCLVI]. fol. 353-356. It begins:

Incipit vita beati Alexii. Fuit vir simplex in Roma, cui nomen erat Eufumianus. .<sup>6</sup>

I would next mention certain new MSS. of a version already well-known. It is a Latin version<sup>7</sup> found in eleven MSS. most of which are at the Bibl. Nat. at Paris; to this I would add the following five new MSS.:

1. Bologna, Bibl. Universitaria, Cod. 1473. Cod. membr., in fol., saec. xii (a. 1180). It begins thus:

Vita Sancti Alexii confessoris.—Fuit | Rome uir magnus | et nobilis Eufemi | nianus nomine. | diues ualde et primus | in palatio imperatoris erantque | ei tria milia pueri . . .

2. Berne, Stadtbibliothek, Cod. 292, N. 25, fol. 123 b—127 a, saec. xi.

3. Munich, Hofbibl., Clm. 2610 (=Ald. 80), fol. 40 a.

4. Brit. Mus., Harl. 2801, fol. 68 b—69 b. The beginning of the last three MSS. is practically the same as that of the first one mentioned.

5. Brit. Mus., Harl. 624, fol. 133 b—135 b, of which the end is imperfect. It begins:

Incipit Vita Sancti Alexii Confessoris.  
XVII Kal. IVLII.

Temporibus Archadii et Honorii magnorum imperatorum. fuit rom(a)e quidam uir magnus et nobilis eufemianus nomine. diues ualde. et primus in palatio imperatoris. Erantque ei. .

There are said to be twelve Latin MSS., representing the life of St. Alexis, in the Bibl. Royale at Brussels, and also many Latin and

<sup>4</sup> Dr. Bloesch was so kind as to communicate these facts to me.

<sup>5</sup> See Valentinelli's *Cat.*, ii 165.

<sup>6</sup> See Valentinelli's *Cat.*, v, 289.

<sup>7</sup> See Amiaud, p. xxxi.

a number of German versions among the MSS, in the Universitätsbibl. at Basel. Of Old French prose versions several exist, as has long been known, one of them being in the MS. Bibl. Nat. f. fr. 23 117, fol. 319 c—320 d. I have in my possession a collation of this text, as well as of the one to be mentioned presently, and hope to publish them in the near future. It begins thus:

En ce temps que la loy n(ost)re sei(n)gn(our) estoit creue que les gens se penoient plus de bien faire quil ores ne font estoient e(m)p(er)e-our a ro(m)me ho(n)norez (et) archades. Adont auoit en la cite de ro(m)me. i. haut ho(m)me q(u)i eufemiens fu appelez. . . .

B. N. f. 411, fol. 219 a—222 b contains a text which seems to be the preceding version with enough padding almost to double its length. The nature of this padding may be seen from the following lines with which the MS. begins:

Ncel tens q(ue) la loi n(ost)re seignor estoit creue | et essauciee et q(ue) les genz se penoie(n)t donques | plus de b(ie)n fere qil ores ne font. estoient em- | p(er)eor a rome honoires (et) archades. qi piu estoie(n)t enu(er)s n(ost)re seignor ih(es)u crist. (et) enu(er)s tote criature fermeme(n)t de cui tuit li b(ie)n uiene(n)t (et) nesse(n)t. Adonc auoit en la cite de rome un haut home eufemianus estoit apelez. . . .

In the foregoing article I have endeavored to mention only those MSS. which were unknown to previous investigators of the St. Alexis legend, or which at least contain versions still unpublished. I have no doubt that in continuing my researches many other new MSS. will be brought to light, not to speak for the present of the many versions already published. I take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation of the courtesies extended to me by the officials of not a few of the prominent libraries of this and other countries, whereby they have greatly aided me in my studies on this celebrated legend of St. Alexis.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

Johns Hopkins University.

#### ETYMOLOGY OF FRENCH *coussin*, *couche*, *coucher*.

P. MEYER (*Romania*, xxi, 83) brings forward CÖXINUM as the etymon of French *coussin*, old Fr. and Prov. *coissin*, rejecting Diez' \*CŪLCITINUM (from CŪLCĪTA, 'a cushion') as being

imaginary, contrary to phonetic law, and unnecessary. Diez' etymology has been adopted by Brachet, Scheler, Littré, Gröber (who, however, prefers \*CŪLCĪTINUM, proparoxyton: *Arch. f. Lat. Lex.* i 556), G. Körting ('Lat.-Rom. Wörterb.'), and Skeat (*s. v. cushion*), whence it is reproduced in the English and American dictionaries.

COXINUM ('the thing to be placed under the thighs,' COXA, 'a thigh') is doubtless the prototype of Old Fr. and Prov. *coissin*, Cat. *coixi*, Sp. *cojin* and Ital. *coscino*, *cuscino*. But because it satisfies Old Fr. *coissin*, etc., COXINUM cannot at the same time be accepted as the etymon of *cousin*, which evidently has had a different history.

Ital. *coltrice* CŪLTRICAE by metathesis for CŪLCITRAE leads me to suspect the same transposition for CŪLCĪTA into \*CŪLTICA for the French. CULTICULA occurs for CULCITULA in Festus; CULTICIARIUS for CULCIT (R) ARIUS in a *charte* from the Abbey of St.-Germain-des-Prés, anno 1200, as follows: "*plateam . . . . . contiguam domui Fabiani culticiarii . . . .*" (Du Cange, *s. v.*).

We are then justified in writing a form \*CŪLTICINUM, which regularly gives us *coltt's'in* *coul's'in* *coussin*, the medial *t* of the group *ltc* being lost in the *t* of the fronted *k>lj>ts'*.

The treatment of the medial *t* places this word in the same category with PŪLLICINUM *poussin*. For the Latin form, cf., outside of Diez' 'Wörterb.' (3rd ed.) ii, 404, examples of PULCINUS, -A in Diefenbach, 'Novum Glossarium,' and also Muratori, 'Antiq. Ital.' ii, col. 169, where is quoted a diploma of Ludwig III (king, afterwards emperor) of about the year 900. This diploma has: *cum aliis insulis* [in the Po?] *quae vulgo pullicini vocantur*. Muratori adds: "Ughellius corrupte habet pulcini." Compare also \*DULCINA (DULCIANA Du Cange, a musical instrument) *dolcine*, *doucine*; *roussin* is possibly RŪNCINUM + SŪLCUS, 'agrestis,' = \*RŪLCINUM (Cf. ROSCINUM = SULCATORIUM, Trier MS. of the *Henrici Summarium*, Diefenbach *s. v. Runcinus*).

Ascoli (*Arch. Glot.*, ix, 103 note) was the first to point out that \*CŪLCINUM—Diez (dimin. of CŪLEX)—does not satisfy phonetic law for Fr. *cousin*, 'gnat,' on account of the voiced *s*. Further investigation will probably show

this word of Provençal origin, where the earlier vocalization of the *l* placed the *ts'* in intervocalic position. (Suchier, 'Grundriss,' i, 582). Cf. PULLICINUM Prov. *polzin*, *pouzi*.

French *couche*, *colchier*, *coucher* can well be derived from \*CŪLTICA (for CŪLCĪTA) \*CŪLTICARE, the verb by levelling from the stem-accented forms: \*CULTICAT *colchet* in Roland. For the *t* preceded by a liquid, cf. PERTICA *perche*; PORTICUM *porche* (see *Z.f.R.P.*, xiv, 561) REVINDICAS *revenches*.

I need not say that this etymology removes the difficulty (supposed or real) of the French *q* which is found instead of the *g* expected from the ordinary etymology CŪLLĪCARE (Diez). In my opinion, the definite idea of 'a bed to lie on' is too well preserved in *couche*, *coucher* and their derivatives for these words to be derived from a form of such general signification as COLLOCARE.

THOMAS A. JENKINS.

Johns Hopkins University.

#### THE ALLEGORY OF DE LORRIS "ROMANCE OF THE ROSE."

THE allegory of the first part of the 'Romance of the Rose,' the four thousand lines written by Guillaume de Lorris, is simply planned and consistently developed. Nearly half a century after death interrupted his work, Jean de Meun took the body and desecrated the soul of the poem, adding to it eighteen thousand lines which have given to the work of de Lorris their own well-deserved reputation for bad art and bad morals. The connection between the two portions—or rather the two poems comprised under the one title—does not, however, extend beyond the names of a few characters and the barest outline of plot.

The original plan of the Romance was, briefly: under the allegory of the plucking of a rose to symbolize the wooing of a woman. The conventional Lover, in the conventional dream of mediæval poetry, is admitted to the garden of Pleasure, and, after dancing with the merry company around the God of Love, explores the garden. Beside the fountain of Narcissus he becomes enamored of a rose, and, in attempting to pluck it, is pierced by Love's arrows.

Evidently a rose could have no objection to being gathered, neither could it feel any responsive regard for the enamored youth. It was, therefore, necessary to symbolize the sentiments of a maiden, and to make them independent characteristics. De Lorris, with a stroke of genius which surpasses everything in his poem, comprehended the mind of a woman in the early days of a too vehement wooing, analyzed its conflicting emotions, and gave to each a personality and a name. They divide into two parties, those who aid and those who oppose the Lover. His most formidable foe is *Dangier*, which M. Gaston Paris translates "the tendency, innate in a woman, not to yield without resistance to him who implores her." The Chaucerian use of *Danger* in the same sense is familiar. The strongest ally is *Bel Accueil*; to quote M. Paris again, "the favor which the same woman shows at another time." To me it seems rather that good fellowship which a woman may give to a man whom she does not consider as even a potential lover. *Camaraderie* in modern French, and *Chumminess* in current American, express the idea.

After many rebuffs, the Lover's course is prosperous, and Venus procures for him permission to kiss the Rose. The introduction of Venus is symbolic of the first response to the Lover's passion, the awakening of a reciprocal feeling in the lady of his choice. His bliss is brief, for a new set of foes arise against him, personifications of the thoughts and conventions of the world, with which lovers are usually at strife. A varied conflict is waged; aided by the new forces, the Lover's enemies prevail; and when his prospects seem most hopeless, the poem abruptly stops.

The chief difficulty of an English translation or paraphrase of this work lies in finding equivalents for the names bestowed on the allegorical characters. French readers have the advantage of employing practically the same medium used in the construction of the original. The fourteenth century English version, which we may call Chaucerian even if we do not care to ascribe it to Chaucer, gives a literal translation, and the connection between the languages justified the method. But we have grown away from the French as

well as from the English of the Middle Ages, and the direct adoption of words often fails to reproduce the original ideas. That the method of literal translation is now inadequate is shown by Mr. Henry Morley's paraphrase of the Romance in his 'English Writers.'

When, for example, *Dangier* is rendered *Danger*, the average reader entirely loses the significance of the French word. *Fair Reception* is a direct translation of *Bel Accueil*; but *Fair Reception* in Mr. Morley's paraphrase does not mean what *Bel Accueil* does in the original. There are in the 'Romance of the Rose' terms used with two meanings; as, *Honte* is one of the arrows of Love, and is also one of the defenders of the Rose; *Doux Regard* is the companion of the God of Love and is also one of the comforters promised to the Lover. When, therefore, *Honte* is translated always as *Shame*, and *Doux Regard* invariably as *Sweet Look*, the interpretation is needlessly confused; for whoever has read the poem must know that *Doux Regard* as the kindly feeling attendant on Love, and *Doux Regard* as the vision of his lady that cheers the Lover, are far from the same quality, and that neither is satisfactorily rendered by *Sweet Look*.

The translation can often be best made from the context; as, for instance, in the case of the word last cited. The introduction of *Doux Regard* as the companion of the God of Love, bearing his arrows when they are not in use, but relinquishing them when action is required, makes it apparent that he here personifies love potential or quiescent, the sentiment of friendliness.

In the following paragraph, I have endeavored to give modern equivalents for the original words, wherever the Chaucerian version is archaic or obsolete. When no word appears in the third column, the modern rendering is the same as the Chaucerian.

PICTURES ON THE OUTER WALL OF THE GARDEN:

ORIGINAL.	CHAUCEAN.	
Convoitise	Coveitise	Covetousness
Envie	Envye	
Felonnie	Felony	
Haine	Hate	Hatred
Papelardie	Pope-Holy	Hypocrisy
Povreté	Povert	Poverty



## PICTURES ON THE OUTER WALL OF THE GARDEN:

ORIGINAL.	CHAUCEAN.	
Tristesse	Sorowe	
Vieillesse	Elde	Age
Vilennie	Vilany	

## INHABITANTS OF THE GARDEN:

Biauté	Beaute	
Cortoisie	Cortesie	
Dédiut	Myrthe	Pleasure
Doux Regard	Swete Lokyng	Friendliness
Franchise	Fraunchise	Freedom
Jonesce		Youth
Largesce	Largesce	Liberality
Liesce	Gladness	Mirth
Oiseuse	Ydelnesse	Indolence
Richece	Richesse	Wealth

## ARROWS OF THE GOD OF LOVE:

Desespérance	Wanhope	Despair
Honte	Shame	
Novel-Penser	New-thought	Fickleness
Orguex	Pride	
Vilenie	Vylanie	Baseness
Biau Semblant	Fair Semblaunt	Affability
Biauté	Beaute	
Compaignie	Company	Association
Cortoisie	Cortesie	
Franchise		Freedom
Simplece	Symplesse	Simplicity

## COMFORTERS PROMISED TO THE LOVER:

Dous Parlers	Swete speche	Pleasant Converse
Dous Pensers	Swete thenkyng	Pleasant Thought
Dous Regars	Swete lokyng	Pleasant Vision
Espérance	Hope	

## ALLIES OF THE LOVER:

Bel Acueil	Bialacoil	Comradery
Franchise	Fraunchise	Frankness
Pitié	Pite	

## ENEMIES OF THE LOVER:

Dangier	Daunger	Reserve
Honte	Shame	Modesty
Jalousie	Jelousie	Suspicion
La Veille	Vekke	Conventionality
Male-Bouche	Wikkid-tunge	Slander
Paour	Drede	Fear

## ELIZABETH DEERING HANSCOM.

Yale University.

## SPANISH LITERATURE.

*Rotrou-Studien.* I. Jean de Rotrou als Nachahmer Lope de Vega's. Von GEORG STEFFENS, Dr. Phil., Berlin, Gronau: 1891, pp. 104.

*Boccaccios Novelle vom Falken und ihre Verbreitung in der Litteratur.* Nebst Lope de Vegas Komödie: 'El Halcon de Federico,' von RUDOLF ANSCHUETZ. Erlanger Beiträge zur Englischen Philologie u. vergleichende Litteraturgeschichte. Erlangen: 1892, pp. 100.

THE influence of the Spanish drama upon the French theatre in the seventeenth century is a very interesting field of research, and the work of Dr. Steffens, upon the particular authors he has chosen, is a very thorough and scholarly one. At the outset, however, we are not a little surprised to find that, in the introductory chapter "Zur Biographie Rotrou's und zur Geschichte der Rotrou-Forschung," the name of Puibusque is conspicuous by its absence. It is now just fifty years ago since the latter's 'Histoire comparée des littératures espagnole et française' appeared. Dr. Steffens frequently quotes Schack, 'Geschichte der dramatischen Literatur und Kunst in Spanien,' which was first printed at Frankfurt, in 1845, two years later. Has Dr. Steffens overlooked Puibusque? Or, as the introduction is to contain 'eine kritische Zusammenstellung der wichtigsten Schriften über den Dichter,' did he not think him of sufficient importance? To judge from some of the very inferior, and in our author's own opinion, sometimes almost worthless books, that find a place in his list, this latter supposition is hardly probable. We are well aware that it is frequently said now-a-days, that the work of Puibusque is out of date, that he is often wrong, and oftener inaccurate, yet it is equally true that he is often right, and it seems that in the discussion of the present question, his book is worthy of mention. That Puibusque was not so far wrong in his estimate of Rotrou is shown by the following:

"Mais si Rotrou avait le pied plus ferme et la main plus haute que Hardy, Tristan, Mairat et du Ryer, il ne mettait guère plus de régularité et de suite dans sa marche; le désordre de ses plans et la négligence de son style l'ont empêché de se soutenir au rang qu'il avait conquis. Sur ses trente-sept pièces, trois ou quatre seulement ont mérité de vivre; pourquoi le cacher? Le poète de Dreux avait le laisser-aller de La Fontaine, et n'en avait pas le patrimoine; harcelé par des créanciers qui lui demandaient sans cesse de l'argent ou

des pièces, il trouvait plus facile de leur donner des pièces que de l'argent; mais pressé de vendre son temps pour payer ses dettes, il fit un peu de tout, des comédies, des tragi-comédies, des pastorales; la littérature espagnole, cette providence de nos auteurs aux abois, lui fournit les *Occasions perdues*, la *belle Alfrède*, les *Deux pucelles*, *Laure persécutée*, *Célie*, ou *le vice-roi de Naples*, *don Bernard de Cabrère*, et à peine eut-il le loisir de versifier des ouvrages qu'il aurait dû commencer par refondre."

That Rotrou was a *poète à gages* is confirmed by Chapelain's letter quoted by Steffens.<sup>1</sup>

Of the plays of Rotrou, which Puibusque above says were taken from the Spanish, Steffens shows (p. 103), that Rotrou's 'Don Lope de Cardone,' which Schack asserts also to be an imitation of Lope de Vega's 'Don Lope de Cardona,'<sup>2</sup> has nothing in common with it save the title. Here we must turn Puibusque's criticism, in speaking of another play,—the 'Amour Médecin' of Molière and its supposed relation to Tirso de Molina's 'Amor medico,'—against himself: "L'identité de titre n'a pu également tromper que ceux qui jugent sur l'étiquette," etc.<sup>3</sup>

In part II, Steffens takes up the plays of Rotrou founded upon Lope de Vega, beginning with the latter's 'La Sortija del olvido' and Rotrou's 'La bague de l'oubli.' Then follow Lope's 'La ocasion Perdida' and Rotrou's 'Les occasions perdues'; Rotrou's tragi-comedia 'L'heureuse constance,' and Lope's 'El poder vencido y el amor premiado' and 'Mirad à quien alabais.' Rotrou's 'La belle Alfrède' is shown to have nothing to do with Lope's 'La hermosa Alfréda.' Here again similarity of title deceived both Schack and Puibusque. Rotrou's 'L'heureux naufrage' may be founded upon Lope's 'El naufragio prodigioso,' which latter exists only as a *suella*, and was out of our author's reach. As to Rotrou's 'Don Bernard de Cabrère' and 'La adversa fortuna

<sup>1</sup> Cf. from another letter of Chapelain's: 'Le docteur, de poète comique se fait lieutenant au baillage de Dreux,' with Puibusque ('Hist. comparée,' vol. ii, p. 414).

<sup>2</sup> On this play of Lope de Vega's, Shirley founded his drama 'The young Admiral.' Shirley, who has been much praised for the originality of his plots, took many of them from the Spanish dramatists. See Stiefel, "Die Nachahmung spanischer Komödien in England unter den Stuarts." *Romanische Forschungen*, v, p. 196.

<sup>3</sup> Puibusque, ii, 227.

de Don Bernardo Cabrera,' doubtfully ascribed to Lope, nothing is settled, as Steffens was unable to see the latter play. The 'Laure Persécutée' is proven to have been modelled upon Lope's 'Laura perseguida,' and not upon Guevara's 'Reinar despues de morir,' as Schack, ('Nachträge,' p. 104.) supposed. Of this play of Rotrou's, Puibusque says:

"On suppose que cette tragi-comédie, imitée de la 'Nise perseguida' de Bermudez, a été mise à profit par Lamotte, pour son *Inès de Castro*, et cette conjecture n'a rien que de très-vraisemblable" (p. 414).

This statement is incorrect. Steffens shows that in none of his plays has Rotrou so closely followed Lope de Vega, as in his 'Laure persécutée'; at least up to the beginning of the third act.

Dr. Steffens' monograph is a very thorough and conscientious piece of work, which shows wide reading and painstaking research. A very minute analysis of such of the plays of Vega and Rotrou as are discussed is given, and they are carefully compared and their relation to each other established. The author promises a study of Rotrou and his other Spanish sources in another essay.

There is perhaps no story from the 'Decamerone' so well known, indirectly at least, on this side of the Atlantic, as the one upon which Longfellow has founded his charming 'Falcon of Ser Federigo,' in the 'Tales of a Wayside Inn'; and this fact lends an additional interest to the very careful and conscientious little book of Herr Anschütz. The story is told in the ninth novel of the fifth day, and the tale is briefly summarized by Boccaccio as follows:

'Federigo degli Alberighi ama, & non è amato, & in cortegia spendendo il suo si consuma, & rimangli un falcone, il quale, non hauendo altro, dà a mangiare alla sua donna uenutagli a casa, laqual ciò sappiendo mutata di animo il prende per marito, & fallo ricco.'

Boccaccio says that the story 'used to be told' by Coppo di Eorghese Domenichi, a worthy citizen of Florence, who, being advanced in years, delighted in relating "delle cose passate co suoi vicini & con altri." Coppo is

<sup>4</sup> Fol. 154, v. ed. 1527.

a historical character, who died between 1348 and 1353. Our author says: "Christofano Landini bestätigt in seinem Dante-Kommentar, dass Boccaccio die Erzählung aus Coppo Munde gehört habe," and cites Manni, 'Istoria del Decamerone,' p. 364. Manni says: "Landini inferisce, che la presente novella l'ha il Boccaccio intesa dalla viva voce di Coppo, parlandone sul Canto viii, dell' Inferno di Dante." Boccaccio in his 'Comento' speaks twice of Coppo, as follows: "Fu questo Filippo Argenti (secondochè ragionar solea Coppo di Borghese Domenichi)," etc., and again on page 434: "Questa Gualdrada, secondochè solea il venerabile uomo Coppo di Borghese Domenichi raccontare," etc. Landino it is true, says: "Costui (Filippo Argenti), secondochè'l Boccaccio dice hauere inteso di Coppo di Borghese," etc., (fol., 50, Ed. 1578).

It is very probable that Boccaccio, born in 1313, may have heard the story from the lips of Messer Coppo, but he nowhere says that he did so hear it. Manni makes no attempt to trace the story further than Boccaccio's immediate source. He tells us that a Federigo di Messer Filippo degli Alberighi had a small estate (*poderetto*), at Campi. Though Coppo tells the story of the falcon as an actual fact, happening in his own time, our author seeks to trace the story further, to a tale in the 'Pantschatantra.' (Benfey ii, 247), but we believe, with Varnhagen, that there is no relation between them 'es sei denn dass die doch wohl vorauszusetzenden Zwischenglieder nachgewiesen würden'; nor does the story of Abou Adi Hatem, who, having no other means to entertain his guests, kills his horse to provide a repast for them, show any greater resemblance to Boccaccio's story.

Our author now examines "Die Verbreitung der Novelle in der Litteratur," beginning with Hans Sachs and going down to our own times. Of these, one of the most interesting is Lope de Vega's *comedia*, 'El Halcon de Federico,' a play that first appeared in the very rare "Trezena Parte de las Comedias de Lope de Vega Carpio," etc., Madrid, 1620. An analysis of Lope's play is given, which shows how

<sup>5</sup> 'Il Comento di Giovanni Boccaccio,' etc. Firenze, Le Monnier. 1863, vol. ii, p. 150.

closely he followed the tale in the 'Decamerone,' even the two brothers, who urge Monna Giovanna to marry again, after the death of her first husband, and who have been omitted in all other versions of the tale, to the present day, here appear under the names of Eliano and Celio. Herr Anschütz has done a good service to Spanish literature in reproducing, entire, the play of Lope, which has not been reprinted since the original editions of 1620, though it must be confessed that 'El Halcon de Federico' is a very ordinary play, and is far surpassed by scores of *comedias* by the same author. The last act is very weak, and is especially disappointing. Passing over the various forms in which our story has been employed in other literatures, we come back to Longfellow's 'Tales of a Wayside Inn,' first published in 1863. The author shows how very closely 'The Falcon of Ser Federico' follows the story of Boccaccio, at times even showing striking verbal resemblances. Our attention is also called to a fact which, however, must immediately occur to one acquainted with the tale in the Decameron, and that is, how everything objectionable has been eliminated by Longfellow. In his poem, Federigo's love appears in a much more exalted form,—he does not seek to win the love of the wife of another. Longfellow's Monna Giovanna, as Federigo woos her, is yet unmarried, but he is unfortunate, and his rival succeeds in winning her hand and heart. A comparison of Tennyson's 'Falcon' with its sources, concludes this very interesting book.

HUGO A. RENNERT.

University of Pennsylvania.

#### GERMAN LITERATURE.

*Aus dem Leben eines Taugenichts.* Von JOSEPH FRIEDRICH VON EICHENDORFF. Edited, with an Introduction and Notes, by CARL OSTHAUS, A. M. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co. ix, 176 pp. 12 mo.

WE have to thank Professor Osthaus for a really serviceable and practical text for the earlier part of a German course. Those who would make a beginner acquainted as soon as possible with an easy, extended and independent text, will find here the material desired.

Eichendorff is a charming writer, especially to the young. Like Burns and Wilhelm Müller (and, in less degree, Rückert) his lyric notes find immediate response in the popular heart, and the same simplicity and directness of expression appear in this prose romance. Moreover the American temperament, in spite of its inheritance of strenuous Anglican propensities, and in spite of the ultra-realistic tendencies of our day, can never quite suppress the claims of

"A nature sloping to the southern side."

and it is in a perennial flood of charmingly impossible felicity that the actors of the 'Taugenichts' live, move, and have their being. Professor Osthaus has done his editorial work as practical teachers would wish it done. The discriminating introduction puts the work into relation with broader literary facts, and serves to add "dignity" to the text as a whole (a word which is, perhaps, pressed into too hard service: the dignity of any sincere work being usually safe when left to take care of itself.) In the intelligent Notes there is an avoidance of the laborious erudition which overhangs so many college texts, in which one cannot see the wood for trees. The self-renunciation in this matter has gone far: many suggestions arise of places where a beginner might fairly wish for an explanation, but, then, some modicum of information may be fairly taken for granted. Commendable accuracy is shown.

P. 157, 6 lines from the bottom has *fuore* for *furor*; p. 160, 5 *konfufer* for *konfuser*; p. 31, l. 15 *fagen* for *sagen*; p. 31, l. 21 *fah* for *sah*; p. 10, l. 1, *das* for *dass*.

The artist alluded to on p. 91 is doubtless Johann Erdmann Hummel (1769-1852), who was professor at the Academy of Berlin from 1809 to 1852.

In the note to p. 91, the name of "the poet H. F. Rückert" strikes us as unfortunate. In mentioning the old-German fashion of clothing, revived by the romanticists, it would have been of interest to refer to Barth's portrait of Rückert given in König's 'Deutsche Literaturgeschichte' <sup>20</sup>, p. 597. The typographical appearance of the book is not inferior to that of others in the same series. In the notes, certain of the smaller German type are either from a

wrong font, or are badly proportioned (for example, p. 159).

JAMES TAFT HATFIELD.

Northwestern University.

#### GERMAN LITERATURE.

*Deutsche Schriften des Albrecht von Eyb.*

Herausgegeben und eingeleitet von MAX HERMANN. I. Das Ehebüchlein. II. Die Dramenübertragungen Bacchides, Menæchmi, Philogenia. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. Lii+104, xliii+156 pp. 8vo. (*Schriften zur germanischen Philologie*, herausgegeben von Dr. Max Roediger, iv. v).

In his 'History of German Literature,' Wilhelm Scherer has pointed out the high merits of Albrecht von Eyb's work by stating that he in his translations from Plautus "die alten Possen germanisirte."

Mr. Max Hermann now has undertaken to give the first complete edition of the German writings of this worthy prebendary, who in the beginning of the seventies of the fifteenth century—about a decade before Luther's birth—showed a skill in the use of German prose not equalled by any writer before the reformation.

Whether or not we accept Mr. Hermann's assertion

"that judging from its twelve editions within about seventy years, Albrecht's 'Ehebüchlein' has undoubtedly exercised some real influence upon several generations,"

we must certainly admit that the book is written in a surprisingly easy, fluent and elegant style. Presented as a New Year's gift to the "Imperial City of Nuremberg and her honorable council and community," it treats in a very entertaining way of marriage: "ob einem manne sey zunemen ein eelich weyb oder nicht," and betrays in many respects the great influence of the humanistic tendencies and studies then flourishing in Italy. It is interesting to observe that in the old scholastic manner, the high ecclesiastical dignitary still refers not to the Bible directly, but to the Fathers, especially to Lactantius. The whole book is a queer mixture of priestly unctuousness and worldliness, the latter exhibiting itself in tales that would prove—even if the



name of Boccaccio were not quoted in several places—that this great Italian poet was among Albrecht's favorite writers.

According to Mr. Hermann's opinion, the reasons of which he will undoubtedly offer in the promised volume on 'Albrecht von Eyb und die Frühzeit des deutschen Humanismus,' the above-mentioned New Year's gift inaugurated a period of considerable productiveness in German writings; for the editor believes the translations from Plautus and Ugolino Pisani to have been written in 1472 and 1473.

Mr. Hermann's edition which, in the reprint of the text as well as in the introductory matter, deserves great praise for careful and accurate philological work, offers an excellent opportunity to examine Albrecht's method of translation. It has been Mr. Hermann's good fortune—if we may so call the success of methodical researches—to find Albrecht's own copies of the Latin originals, together with many introductory and marginal notes representing the wisdom of his Italian university professors. The reprinting of those of the notes that were of influence on the translation helps us to appreciate still better the work of this writer of the early modern times, who so independently and artistically transformed the old figures of Roman comedy into men and women of his own age, and who according to his own words made it his task to translate those Latin plays

'nach seinem vermögen, nit als gar von worten zu worten, wann das gar vnuerstentlich wäre, sunder nach dem synn vnd maining der materien, als sy am verstendlichisten vnd besten lauten mügen.'

MAX BLAU.

Thayer Academy, Mass.

#### FRENCH READERS.

*Reading French Grammar.* By E. H. MAGILL, A. M., LL. D., Ex-President and Professor of French in Swarthmore College. Philadelphia: Christopher Sower Co. 146 pp.

*Le Piano de Jeanne, and Qui perd gagne.* By Francisque Sarcey. Annotated for Schools and Colleges, with a biographical sketch of the author by EDWARD H. MAGILL, A. M., LL. D. Philadelphia: Christopher Sower Co., 194 pp.

Most teachers of language at the present

time seem to think that a pupil should not spend much time in studying grammar before he is brought into contact with the language *en masse*; there is, accordingly, a demand for "brief" grammars, and some of the best scholars and teachers have tried to supply this want, among them Professor Magill, whose grammar, as the title implies, is not intended to teach composition, but merely *reading*, and from this point of view the book has many good qualities. Since, in order to read French, the verb is almost the only portion of the grammar that requires much study, Professor Magill has put it at the very beginning of his book. Then follow the other parts of speech in their usual order. This part of the book, which he terms "etymology," occupies forty-eight pages. Then follows syntax, sixty-six pages, and finally "Some Common Idioms," twenty-five pages.

If one should construe the title of the volume strictly, the two latter portions are hardly necessary, but they greatly increase the usefulness of the book for the average teacher, since they nearly all pay some attention to writing French. No effort is made to teach pronunciation, it being the author's opinion that this cannot be learned from books; neither are any exercises provided, because these may be taken from the texts read.

One of the strongest points in the book is the large number of illustrative examples given, and any student who masters these will rarely find an idiom that he will have any difficulty in translating.

This volume is the first of a projected series of the productions of some of the abler writers in France of the present generation. Among these, F. Sarcey holds an honorable place, and Professor Magill has, therefore, done our students of French a service in thus introducing them to him. Both of the stories in this book are perfectly pure and unobjectionable. They are also interesting and are written in the style made familiar by the "feuilletons" of the better class of French journals of the present day. There are thirty-five pages of notes, containing a great deal of useful information, showing the practiced teacher.

The typography of both of these books is

good, and they are remarkably free from printer's errors.

O. B. SUPER.

Dickinson College.

#### CHAUCER.

*Chaucers Liv og Digting.* Af OTTO JESPERSEN. Studier fra Sprog—og Oldtidsforskning udg. af det philologiskhistoriske Samfund. Kjøbenhavn: Kleins Forlag. 1893.

EARLY English literature has been so generally neglected by Scandinavian scholars that the appearance of a Danish work on Chaucer deserves a warm welcome at our hands. Particularly is this the case when the title-page bears the name of Dr. Otto Jespersen. The favorable impression made by this author's recent treatment of the English case is repeated here. While not pretending to be either an original contribution to the study of Chaucer, or a full account of what has been accomplished in this direction by other scholars, Dr. Jespersen's monograph may serve as an admirable guide to Danish students of our first great modern poet. The author has carefully considered and compared the claims of the various theories with regard to Chaucer's life and works and while many may fail to accept the result reached by him, all must at least acknowledge their perfect honesty. One strange omission among the authorities consulted should not be allowed to pass unnoticed. Although the author quotes from Bierfreund's 'Kulturbserere,' a Danish work published in 1892, he makes no mention of Lounsbury's 'Studies in Chaucer,' which appeared in the same year.

In examining a work of this kind, the first question that naturally suggests itself is the apportioning of space to the various topics, and this particularly in the first part, the biographical. While this is largely a matter of individual judgment, it would seem unwise to devote less than half a page to the vexed question of the date of Chaucer's birth, four pages to the far less important claim of the poet's marital unhappiness, and less than a page to the date of his marriage and the identity of his wife.

After dismissing with appropriate brevity the claim for 1328 as the year of Chaucer's birth,

in connection with which he repeats the misstatement with regard to the occurrence of this date on the monument in the Abbey, the author proceeds to consider the significance of the record of Chaucer's oath. Giving only the first statement in this, which is rather misleadingly translated "godt og vel fyrre," he adopts the date 1345, without stating the possibility of an earlier date.

In his study of the poet's works, to which three quarters of the space has wisely been devoted, Dr. Jespersen shows discrimination in selection, and critical taste in exposition. This latter quality is especially displayed in the admirable parallel drawn between the Decameron and the Canterbury Tales. Had Dr. Jespersen been acquainted with Lounsbury's work he would have found his arguments in favor of the independence of the tales anticipated, and his case against the English and Germans mightily strengthened. Special note should be taken of the graceful translation of two Chaucerian rondeaux by Niels Möller, printed here for the first time.

We shall look forward with interest to further English studies by Dr. Jespersen.

DANIEL KILHAM DODGE.

University of Illinois.

#### CORRESPONDENCE.

##### THE LEGEND OF THE HOLY GRAIL.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—In my paper on "The Legend of the Holy Grail" in Vol. viii., No. 1 of the *Publications of the Modern Language Association*, I have spoken of the Thornton Sir Perceval in terms which I fear may lead to a misunderstanding. I do not, of course, claim for this poem in its present form such antiquity as my unguarded statements might lead one to suppose, and it is for the purpose of forestalling criticism that I beg space for this note. An unhappy peculiarity of all the Holy Grail romances, even of Chrestien's and of the mabinogi, is that they are none of them originals. The English poem, Sir Perceval of Galles, is contained in the Thornton Manuscript, a book compiled, about 1440, by Robert Thornton, of East Newton, Yorkshire. Its

author cannot even be conjectured. From the language I should judge that it had been written in the preceding century. J. O. Halliwell, editing it in 1844, had no doubt that it was a translation of the Conte du Graal. By calling it one of the earliest known sources of the legend, I mean that it is *not* a translation of any part of the Conte du Graal, nor of any other romance that has come down to us. It therefore represents a phase of the legend which, with those represented in the mabinogi and in Chrestien's part of the Conte du Graal, may be considered as the earliest that have survived. That the author of Sir Perceval had read and in some respects imitated the poem of Chrestien, there can be no disputing, but the divergences are so numerous and important, that it is reasonable to attribute them to some unknown original, which had an influence upon the English writer equal to that exercised by Chrestien.

GEORGE MCLEAN HARPER.

Princeton University.

#### OLD ENGLISH POETRY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—In the February number of MOD. LANG. NOTES appeared an interesting comparison, by Professor Cook, of Shelley's "Lines written among the Euganean Hills" and the same poetic conception found in Old Norse.

His statement as to the "essential poetic quality of our Old English verse" is true and timely. No where in early germanic poetry is such a beautiful conception of Nature found, poetic figures that are so simple and yet so grand. The following passages suggest themselves:

*oð þät hrefn blaca, heofones wynne  
blið-heort bodode. þä cöm beorht sunne  
scacan ofer grundas.*

Beowulf, l. 1802.

*nē þis ne dagað ēastan, nē hēr draca ne  
flēogeð,*

l. 3.

*hräfen wandrode.*

l. 34.

*sweart ond sealo-brün.*

"Finnsburg Fragment."

After reading these lines, in or away from their natural setting, how easy it is to feel the sentiment contained in the following:

Mid the mountains Euganean  
I stood listening to the pean  
With which the legion'd rooks did hail  
The Sun's uprise majestic,  
Gathering round with wings all hoar,  
Though the dewy mist they soar  
Like gray shades, till the eastern heaven  
Bursts,

The lines cited from the "Finnsburg Fragment" find, perhaps, a more suggestive parallel in von Eichendorff's "Eginhard und Emma":

Es ist schon wieder Abend, wunderbar  
verzerrt die Welt da draussen sich: wie Drachen  
Mit grauen Nebelschweifern überm Walde  
Schlingt sich der Höhenrauch, und drunter liegts  
So lauernd still, wie finsterner Rache Grimm.

GLEN LEVIN SWIGGETT.

Johns Hopkins University.

#### THE MEANING OF THE WORD "CHINA."

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS:—The word *china* has been referred to by Mr. F. M. Page in MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. 8, at page 26, who says it is the "common name given to native women on the camps," in the Argentine Republic. Also, by Dr. Karl Lentzner at page 85 of the same volume, who says:

"With regard to the word *china*, in Guatemala and Nicaragua it has quite a different meaning from that known elsewhere; for example in Peru, where it means a half-caste of Indian and European parents. In Guatemala *china*, is the nursemaid, and *chinear* means 'to look after children.'"

*China* is not Spanish but a Quichua word, and Garcilaso de la Vega, whose mother was a *palla*, or woman of the Inca blood, and his father one of the *conquistadores* says in his 'Comentarios reales del Perú,' parte primera, foja 68. r., "China llaman á la Doncella muchacha de servicio," that is: a maid servant is called *china*.

*China* is really a Quichua word and means female, *hembra*, and is used to distinguish the sex of animals. The book is not at hand just now but the word may be found in Clement R. Markham's 'Grammar and Dictionary of the Quichua,' published by Trübner.

In connection with the word it may be said that all through the Argentine Republic it is used for a servant—a woman of the lower class; it is used in the diminutive *chinita*, and a man who is given to company of that kind is said to be *muy chinitero*.

B. W. GREEN.

Richmond, Va.

## JOURNAL NOTICES.

**BEITRÄGE ZUR GESCHICHTE DER DEUTSCHEN SPRACHE UND LITERATUR. VOL. XVII, NO. 2.**—**Aron, O.**, Zur geschichte der verbindungen eines *s* bez. *sch* mit einem consonanten im neuhochdeutschen.—**Helten, W. van**, Grammatisches. xviii. Zur geschichte der den got. *-ōs*, *-ōm*, *-ōn*, und *-ō* entsprechenden endsilbenvocale in den anderen altgerm. dialecten und verwandtes. xix. Zur geschichte des *-au(-)* im altgermanischen. xx. Über die erhaltung des *-u* in drei- und viersilbigen formen im ahd., as. und aonfrk. xxi. Über die entsprechongen von altem *\*nassuz*, *\*χαιζυζ*, *\*skapi*. Nachträge.—**Bremer, O.**, Zu v. Richthofens Altfriesischem wörterbuch.—**Kisch, G.**, Die Bistritzer mundart verglichen mit der moselfränkischen.—**Waldstein, E.**, Eine vermeintliche ausnahme der *i*-umlautsregel im altnordischen.—**Uhlenbeck, C. C.**, Etymologisches.

**ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DEUTSCHE PHILOGIE. VOL. XXV, NO. 4.**—**Boer, R. C.**, *Þiðreks saga* und *Niflunga saga*.—**Kochricht, R.**, Zwei berichte über eine Jerusalemfahrt (1521) ii.—**Ellinger, G.**, Johann Sebastian Mitternacht. Ein beitrage zur geschichte der schulkomödie im 17. jahrhundert.—**Englert, A.**, Mitteilungen über handschriften der Zweibrückener gymnasialbibliothek.—**Jellteles, A.**, Lied, genannt: das menschliche leben ein traum.—Literatur und miscellen.

**ARKIV FÖR NORDISK FILOLOGI. NEW SERIES. VOL. V, PART 3.**—**Storm, Gustav**, Vore Forhedres Jro paa Sjøelevandring og deres Opkaldelsessystem.—**Olsen, Björn Magnusson**, Små bidrag til tolkning af Eddasangen.—**Kock, Axel**, Behandlingen av fornsvenskt kort *y*-ljud och supradentalers invärkan på vokalisationen.—**Kock, Axel**, Till frågan om supradental *l* och *n* i det nordiska fornspråket.—**Lind, E. H.**, Bibliografi för år 1891.—**Boer, R. C.**, Noch einmal Qrvar-Odds saga und Magus saga.—**Cederschild, G.**, Slutnamarkning.—**Larsson, Ludvig**, Anmälan av "Katalog over den arnamagnæanske håndskriftsamling. Andet bind 1. hefte."

**REVUE DE PHILOGIE TOME VI, FASCICULE 2. 1892.**—**Cledat, Leon**, Les Troubadours et l'Amour courtois en France aus xii. et xiii. siècles.—**Passy, Paul**, Notes sur quelques patois vosgiens (fin).—**C. L.**, Fable du troubadour Pierre Cardinal, traduction archaïque et rythmée.—Livres et articles signalés: **Restori**, Letteratura provenzale.—**Binet**, Le style de la lyrique courtoise en France.—**Rigal**, De l'établissement de la tragédie en France.—**Koschwitz**, La phonétique expérimentale.—**Bastin, J.**, Glanures grammaticales.—**Delbœuf, J.**, Réflexions grammaticales.—**Doutrepont, G.**, Étude linguistique sur Jacques de Hemricourt.—**Crescini**, Per gli studi romanzl.—**Devaux, A.**, Langue vulgaire du Dauphiné septentrional au moyen âge.—**Lot, F.**, L'enseignement supérieur en France.—**FASCICULE 4.**—**Cledat, Leon**, Phonétique raisonnée du français moderne.—**Vingtrinier, Aime**, Un branle des montagnes du Lyonnais.—**Comblat**, Dictons en patois de Germolles (Saône-et-Loire).—Livres et articles signalés.—Index alphabétique des livres et article

signalés du tome vi.—Bulletin de la Société de réforme orthographique.

**NEUPHILOLOGISCHES CENTRALBLATT. NO. 1. JANUAR, 1893.**—Fünfter allgemeiner deutscher Neuphilologentag (**Hartung**, Über die Methode des Anfangsunterrichts in den neuen Sprachen, speziell, im Englischen).—The late Alfred Baron Tennyson, Poet Laureat.—Berichte aus den Vereinen: Halle a. S.—Literatur: *Besprechungen* (**Bierbaum**, Lehrbuch der französischen Sprache iii [Fath]; **Kuehn**, Französisches Lesebuch für Anfänger.—Französisches Lesebuch für die Unterstufe.—Französische Schulgrammatik.—Kleine Französische Schulgrammatik [Behne]; **Tendering**, Lehrbuch der englischen Sprache [Röver]; **Hupe**, The English Intellect during the xvi., xvii., and xviii. Centuries by Buckle; **Koch**, Mittelstufe für den Unterricht in der englischen Sprache ii [Wendt]; **Schulz**, Catalogue méthodique des Revues et Journaux [Kasten]; **Anschütz**, Boccaccio's Novelle vom Falken [Sandmann]).—**FEBRUAR, NR. 2.**—Fünfter allgemeiner deutscher Neuphilologentag (**Wagner**, Französische Quantität unter Vorführung des Albrechtschen Apparates).—Berichte aus den Vereinen: Hannover, **Dr. Philippstal**; **Edouard Rod** et son nouveau roman *La Sacrifice*; **Cassel**, Quiehl: Aufenthalt in Paris; **Zergiebel**: Französische Schulbücher; **Krummacher**: Englische Schulbücher; **Quiehl**: **Beyer** und **Passy**, Elementarbuch; **Franfurt**: Semester-Bericht des Kartell-Verbandes Neuphilologischer Vereine Deutscher Hochschulen.—Literatur: *Besprechungen* (Wendt, England, seine Geschichte, Verfassung und staatlichen Einrichtungen [Kasten]; **Regel**, Eiserner Bestand; **Drey-Spring**, The cumulative Method [Wendt]; **Oliphant**, The Heir Presumptive and the Heir Apparent; **Englert**, Anthologie des Poètes français modernes [Ackermann]; **Brioux**, Monsieur de Reboval; **Engel**, Isokrates, Machiavelli, Fichte; **Heyse**, Italienische Dichter seit der Mitte des 18. Jahrhunderts [S-e]; **Brambilla**, Studi letterari; **Valcarengli**, Distruzione ed altri racconti [Söhns]).—**MÄRZ, NR. 3.**—**Freund**, Aus der russischen Spruchweisheit.—Literary Paris.—Berichte aus den Vereinen: Hannover, **E. G. Paris**, La Poésie du Moyen-Âge; Hamburg, **Fels**: Die französische Akademie; **Paris**, Conseil de l'Association phonétique.—Literatur: *Besprechungen* (Lüttge, Englisches Lehr- und Übungsbuch [Wendt]; **Western**, Englische Aussprache [Wendt]; **Saure**, Seamer's Shakespeare Stories [Becker]; **Guenther**, English Letters [Becker]; **Loewe**, La France et les Français, Mittelstufe [Sandmann]; **Loewe**, Cours français. ii. partie [Sandmann]; **Burtin**, Choix de lectures françaises [Söhns]; **Maurens** et **Rousseau**, L'Instantané).